

THE  
MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1871.

---

ART. I.—EDUCATION.

BY J. W. NEVIN, D. D.

---

EDUCATION has place only in the sphere of humanity. It is the privilege and dignity exclusively of man, as distinguished from every lower nature in the world. We do, indeed, speak at times of educating animals, and even go so far perhaps as to apply the term to the culture of trees and plants. But in every such case we must be considered as using language in an improper or, at least, in a simply figurative sense.

Plants and animals are not subjects for education. The constituent elements of the process, the inward spiritual forces by which only it can be brought to pass, are altogether wanting in their nature. The most we have in these lower spheres of existence, is a remote analogy only with what is here the law of our human life, conformably to the order which holds in general between the world of nature and the world of mind.

Nature at large is in order to mind, a progressive preparation for its advent as the highest and last sense of the world, and thus an obscure foreshadowing throughout of what the full presence of mind is found to be ultimately in the form of human personality. All forms of intellectual, moral, social, historical existence, as they appear in the human world, are in this way anticipated and prefigured by blind, unconscious instincts, that

F. K. M. 10

reach toward them continually from all sides in lower systems of being. The distinctive peculiarities of humanity nowhere stand out in completely abrupt separation from the life of the world in its lower view.—On the contrary, the true argument of its superiority appears in the plain fact, that it strikes the roots of this superiority everywhere far down into the universal cosmical order of which it is the glorious efflorescence and crown. Reason has in it an inward affinity with instinct and unconscious plastic power. The ethical and historical are bound to the physical by innumerable analogies that meet us on all sides. And thus it is, as we now say that the idea of education, also in particular, though belonging strictly only to the human sphere, is nevertheless not without its correspondence in the world below man; which then it becomes both interesting and profitable to take note of, as opening the way toward a proper conception of what the interest truly is in its own higher character.

In general it may be said of all this lower living development that it is simply natural growth. Plants and animals come to their full existence through a purely physical process, which is for them as much a matter of passive necessity, as the mechanical changes which are going forward continually in the inorganic world. In both cases, however, we have a movement adumbrating the human educational process in this, that it takes place through the co-operation of two factors or forces; namely, a principle that works from within and an element that determines and conditions this working from without. The life, in either case, can unfold itself in the way of physical growth, only as it is acted upon physically by the presence of outward means and appliances. And as these now may be exhibited in different forms and ways, it is easy to see how it is possible for an outside intelligence to take advantage of them, so as to direct and govern to a certain extent, by the manner in which they are applied, the whole physical development with which they are concerned. In this way there is wide room for horticultural art, as we all know, in the training of plants, by which they are brought to assume forms, and serve purposes al-

together different from anything belonging to what we call, by comparison, their wild or native state. And so it is with animals. They may be broken and drilled by the hand of man to much that they would never come to if left entirely to themselves. We have all met with admirably trained horses and dogs; as we have heard, no doubt, also of learned pigs, to say nothing of curiously disciplined birds and mice. In this case, however, as before, all resolves itself at last into outward physical instrumentation applied by foreign care and skill. The life has been coerced by human art to its own purposes, through an arbitrary disposition of the necessary terms and conditions of its development. All falls immeasurably short still of the true full idea of education. It is, when all is done, training only, purely physical discipline, and nothing more. The process itself, as it has place in the life of the animal, no less than in the life of the plant, is mechanical, blind, passive, and in all respects unfree.

Education properly so called begins, in the scale of being, where this law of mere physical growth ends. It does not, however, disown the physical as an absolute foreign range of existence. For humanity is itself physical as well as spiritual; mind in the case of man is bound throughout to matter; and what we call the ethical or moral world, as it comes into view through our human intelligence and will, is, as already intimated, but the sublimation of the world of matter itself into this higher order of existence. Not only does the movement of nature find its own ultimate signification in mind, but the self-actualizing movement of mind subsequently is conditioned in its whole course by nature; as we see at once in the relation by which the soul is bound to the body; a relation which, rightly considered, may easily be seen to involve of itself also a corresponding necessary conjunction with the world of nature at large. In such view all that belongs to man's life, his bodily nature as well as his mind, comes fairly within the range of education. But so far as this may be so, the physical is then lifted above itself, and brought under the action of forces which take hold of it from a higher sphere.

Education, as such, has to do directly only with the working of these forces. It comes in where the physical organization of the world, having reached its last result in the personality of man, makes room for its ethical organization; where mind bursts like a new sun on the slumbering sense of nature; and where the progress of creation becomes, thence onward, a self-wrought movement in the form of human intelligence and human will. The province of education here is nothing less than to wake mind into existence, to develop its powers, and to give it proper shape and form. Such development is something very different from growth. It is far more than the mere evolution of slumbering natural powers. Whence mind comes, and how it comes, is a great mystery. We only know that it is a product of education. Natural birth does not of itself bring it to pass; there must be added to this for the purpose a second birth going forward in a higher sphere. Only mind, in the actual history of our life, is found able to excite mind to conscious existence; a fact, enough of itself to show one would imagine that mind, as born with us, transcends potentially all the powers of nature, and is, in truth, a new divine principle superadded to these powers; since otherwise the evolution of it into actual consciousness would be sufficiently secured by the conditions of our mere natural growth. There is an original spirit in man from the inspiration of the Almighty, which only the breath of spirit can waken into life. Physical generation must in every case be followed here by moral generation; a different process altogether, which however it may be conditioned and qualified by the physical character of its subjects, holds throughout in the element of intelligence only. This is what we are to understand by education—the power which God has been pleased to lodge in the constitution of humanity, for the development of its forces out to their highest and last end.

The composition of forces which belongs to all growth in the world of nature meets us here again, as already intimated, in the form of a new and higher order foreshadowed by that lower law. All education is a result of the co-efficiency of two factors working conjointly to bring it to pass—one from within



the subject of the process, and the other from without. The high character of the process itself, as having place in the human (more than simply physical) sphere to which we have assigned it, appears strikingly in this that *both* these factors are required to hold in the element of free, conscious spirit. It is not enough that one of them simply be of spiritual quality; that mind, for example, work upon nature (as in the training of animals), or that nature work upon mind. It must be mind working upon mind; intelligence meeting intelligence; will infusing itself into will. Only so can the process be really and truly what we call education.

1. Let us look first at what we may call the outward or *objective* side of the process. Education involves necessarily teaching; and this, we say, must be human teaching, the action of living mind brought home to the subject of the process in a living way. As there are no autochthons among men, people fresh sprung from the earth, so neither are there among them, speaking strictly, any autodidacts, persons purely self-taught. It is well to consider how far this proposition reaches.

It seems to be imagined by some, that mind has the power of evolving itself in man through his individual nature alone, without any other help than what is comprehended in the conditions of his simply natural existence. But it is well established now, that in these circumstances he would never attain to any proper human development whatever. He would never awake at all to the light of thought, nor come at all to the use of speech. As a simply single existence in the system of nature he could never rise into anything more than nature. The very idea of intelligence and freedom implies escape from the power of nature in this view through conscious communion with a wider mode of existence. Mere nature may bring out all that is required for the completeness of a simply animal life; but the very first beginning of human life, in its properly distinctive character, transcends entirely the compass of her powers. The mother's milk is not more necessary for the physical sustenance of her child than is the loving intelligence that beams forth upon it from her eye to kindle in it the first scin-

tillations of spiritual existence. It is deep calling unto deep, soul summoned from the womb of otherwise impenetrable night by the magic power of soul. This is education; an awakening, quickening, generating force exercised upon its subject from without, in the form not of nature but of spirit. And what it is thus at the start, it continues to be throughout.

It might seem indeed at first view, that after education has begun, and some awakening of spirit taken place, nature comes in as a separate force to divide, at least, with mind the office which it thus assigned to its superior agency and power; and that the presence of natural objects perceived in a merely natural way works on the development of mind directly, just as the force of nature is felt in the evolution of simply vegetable or animal life. But this is not the case. It is only in the element of already awakened intelligence, and in full, open communication with its activity, that it is found possible at all for the world of nature to exert an influence upon the world of mind; and then the action is not physical, not a force that belongs to the natural world in its own order of existence, but in truth the higher force of mind itself enshrined in matter, for the sense and apprehension of which the soul has been prepared through the power of education in its proper spiritual form. In the whole case the physical comes into view as the vehicle simply of the spiritual, and offers at best but the outward occasion for this to reveal itself, and make itself felt as the presence of spirit addressing itself to spirit.

In this way, however, the whole outward world does indeed attain to significance; the light of instruction and knowledge gleams through its dark forms, and there is room then to speak of the educational power of natural objects and scenes. Sermons are hid for us then in stones and brooks, and float over us in the clouds of heaven. Waves and winds are continually uttering for us strange things. Lessons are whispered to us in the breeze, and thundered upon us by the storm. Mountains and valleys, forests and plains, spread themselves out before us as open volumes inviting us to read. The entire world, in short, around us and above us, is a parable fraught with wis-

dom for our use. But all this is something which belongs to mind and not to mere bodily sense. It is real for us only in the form of spirit, and not in the form of matter. Animals and brutish men know it not, and have no power to see it. What is for us thus educational in nature is ever the true and beautiful that lie behind it interpreted and made intelligible to us first by the light of our own intelligence, kindled and kept beaming from the world of mind around us.

Throughout, we say, education requires the action of mind on mind; and this can be fully realized only where we have the presentation of thought in other forms supported and enforced by living personal instruction through human teachers. The more remote and indirect the communication is between mind and mind in the process, the less will the relation be found to answer the demands of the case. What is needed is direct contact of life with life, like the kindling of one torch from another. In this view it is, that the spoken word is allowed on all sides to hold so important a place in the business of instruction. Committed to writing, and taken in by the eye from a book, the word is always in some degree sundered from the life that has given it birth.

There is, indeed, a difference here also among written productions themselves, some having in them the power of life far beyond others. There are books, we know, in which the living spirit of their authors is perpetuated, we cannot tell how, age after age. Such is the mysterious relation of word to life, where the word is itself, as first uttered, living and not dead; it becomes, as it were, instinct with the spirit from which it has proceeded in the beginning, so as to carry with it ever after the force of a felt personal presence. So it was most especially with the word of Him who was Himself the Incarnate Word of God, and of whom it is said never man spake like Him. In Him speech became at once the embodiment of absolute truth itself, and what He spake is felt to be of this character still as it has come down to us on the inspired page of the New Testament. "The words that I speak unto you," we hear Him saying, "they are spirit and they are life." So were they to His

disciples in the days of His flesh; but so have they proved themselves to be, in their written form also, through all ages since. And what is thus true eminently of the words of Christ, as committed to writing, must be allowed to hold good, in some degree also, of what is written by the better sort of uninspired men. Something of the same spiritual vitality is to be met with not unfrequently in one class of books, while in another it is wanting altogether.

Still, with all this, it is beyond question, that the word written is not so near to the life it represents as the word spoken; and that instruction addressed to the ear through the voice is, for this reason, more of a lively and life-giving nature, than instruction addressed to the eye through the letter. True, there may be oral teaching that is itself mechanical and dead—the use of words that come from the lips only, and not at all from the soul; in comparison with which, then, many a good book, or vigorously written essay, shall be felt to be full of spirit and life. But we have in view now oral teaching as it ought to be; and are considering simply what may be called the constitutional difference of two modes of instruction—that by books and that by the living teacher. Looking at the matter in this way, it is very certain that the most material and necessary form of education is that which is comprehended in oral instruction. It is just on this principle, that preaching and catechizing are of such vast account for the evangelization of the world, and that hearing the word must ever be, as it ever has been, for Christianity in any wide and general view, something far more important than reading the word. The idea of education can never be complete, without including in the conception of its objective factor the presence of the living human instructor.

Especially must this be so with what we mean by education, taken in its special technical sense, as the discipline by which the young are to be trained and prepared for full-grown life. Here, emphatically, from the nursery to the close of the college course, all depends on having mind held in felt, near, continual intercourse and communion with mind, not through

books, but by means of the voice and the ear. All depends, in other words, in maintaining in full force throughout the old significance and sense of the old relation expressed by the terms master and disciple.

How much is involved in this relation, how much of sacred interest and worth and deeply solemn responsibility it carries with it, is sufficiently clear from what has been already said. In its true ideal, it is emphatically a relation of life, of life, I may add, in its deepest and most inward sense. For where teaching goes forward here in the right way, it is nothing less in fact than the transmission of living light and heat from one soul to another. In their measure, the words of every true teacher are spirit and life. They have in them an inspiration that comes fresh and full from his inmost being, and breathes itself into the inmost being of those who hear him; so that they are made to have part thus in his spiritual existence, and are brought to share in his nature, more than if they were born simply of his natural life. There is brought to pass in the case an inward cognation which goes beyond the bond of kindred blood. It is the consanguinity of ethereal spirit, the relationship of immortal mind.

All this is spoken of course, only of the master and teacher who has in him what the true idea of his vocation requires. How often, alas, the ideal character is found wanting in that which is real. This is necessarily the case always, where the life of the teacher is itself, intellectually or morally, a false bad life; for then by the law of generation here, as everywhere else, any power it may have to propagate itself must prove a curse only for those to whom the propagation extends. It will be a leprosy, not of the body but of the soul, the Mosiac doom in its worst form, transmitting itself from spiritual father to spiritual son, down it may be to the third and fourth generation. Only think of the soul life of a Voltaire, a Byron, or an Aaron Burr, perpetuating itself in this hereditary way! But there is teaching again, it is sad to think how much of it, which is altogether unworthy of the name, not just because it is the power of a positively corrupt life, but because it has in it no real life of any

sort whatever—because, in other words, it resolves itself at last into mere mechanical routine and form. The teacher, in such case, becomes an automaton; his office is shorn of its dignity and strength; and of his whole work and service we may say, that it is the ministration of the letter that killeth rather than the ministration of the spirit that maketh alive.

Education as it should be involves the full opposite of all this; the living presence of the school-master, himself alive with the spirit of virtue and knowledge, and having power to energize into life whatever he is called to touch in his educational work. This is more vastly than all literary and scientific apparatus besides. Without this libraries are dead, and laboratories dreary and cold. This it is that alone has power to light up the walks of science, and to make all studies both fruitful and pleasant. For school, academy, or college, let me reiterate the thought, the one thing needful above every other thing is the presence of living teachers able to teach in a living way.

II. There is however, as already said, another side to the process—a *subjective* side, we may call it, necessary in every case, to complete the working of the objective agency, which we have had thus far under consideration. The power from without the subject must be met harmoniously and co-operatively by a power from within the subject; and this, by the nature of the case as already explained, must also be not physical but moral, the free response of mind answering in its own order of existence to the awakening challenge of mind. To this our attention must now be briefly directed.

There is no education, we have seen which is absolutely its own work; none that is not the result in some way of foreign outside action, and this not in the way of exciting and stimulating occasion simply in the world of nature, but in the way also of kindling life in the world of mind. This is one view of the subject. There are no strictly self-educated and self-made men. But now in opposition to this, though not in real contradiction to it, we have before us the no less unquestionable truth that there can be no education which is not self-education, which is not self-produced and self-wrought. What men

become in this way is ever their own work. They are not simply passive in the development, but active and free. They make themselves. Not only does their nature determine blindly how they are to be acted upon by outside influence, as in the case of animals and plants; but it is only through their own positive activity, put forth as intelligence and will, that any such outside influence can have for them any educational force whatever. Such is the distinguishing prerogative of all personal existence. It is a citadel which no force can enter from without against its own consent. The development of mind can go forward only through its own action as mind. It involves at every point intelligence and will, both exercised in continual conjunction. Knowledge cannot be forced into the brain as food may be crammed into the stomach. The knowing of it, by which only it becomes knowledge, is for every human being his own act, and is something which can never be done for him by proxy or put into him by outward coercion. What a man is through his understanding, that he is emphatically only of and through himself. And still more plainly may this be seen to be true of his practical or moral life, as this holds in the being of the will. For the will, by its very conception, is pure self-action. Nothing can come into it except by its own consent. Thus it is that all truth and virtue are made to be actual and real for men, only by being brought to have place in them by their own act. In this view, every man's life, ethically considered, is a problem which he must solve for himself, which no one else can solve for him. His character throughout is his own work. He creates his personality. Not of course without occasions, opportunities, influences, impulses and motives, both physical and spiritual, brought to bear upon him on all sides from without; but in such a way always, that the power of deciding what amount of plastic force all these shall carry with them is found to rest ultimately still in his own hands. It depends upon himself how far they shall be allowed to come in at all, and also in what manner and form they shall come in, as conditioning means of his education and culture. What takes place actually as such inward work, is something which the sub-



ject of the process in the end has always brought to pass himself.

The law is universal, reaching through the whole course of human training from the cradle to the grave. The relation between freedom and dependence varies with the progress of personal development. The child requires to be held in the leading strings of mere outward, more or less physical discipline, beyond what is proper for youth or early manhood. Yet from the very start, all outward discipline here serves the purpose only of a medium for bringing mind into contact with mind, will into felt relation to will. It is not for the human subject, even in childhood and infancy, what it is for the merely animal or brute subject. In the human subject mind yet undeveloped, and still only potential, is nevertheless actually at hand, and capable of being so reached and wrought upon pre-consciously in its own proper spiritual substance; and its education in these circumstances (its awakening and out-drawing) is from the very beginning always, not a simple physical effect following the constraint of discipline as an outward cause, but a veritable spiritual echo and response to the true higher law of the spiritual world made to touch it in this way. The order of our life demands, that this potential, more or less unconscious freedom should unfold itself more and more into the power of conscious self-apprehension and self-direction; that is what all right education looks to as its great purpose and end; but it lies in the very nature of this process, that it should involve within the subject of it throughout the action of mind working as mind, which is necessarily free always and self-produced. Even the first spark of intelligence in the new born infant, though kindled by the ictus of a ray which is shot into it from another soul, is nevertheless struck from the soul of the infant itself as a principle of light and freedom waiting there to be excited in this way. And so from this point onward; nothing can be put into children educationally, except through their own attention and receptivity voluntarily opened to take in what is offered for that purpose. To how much more then must not such co-working agency amount in more ad-

vanced forms of education, where the right and the power of conscious personal independence are more fully developed? In higher institutions of learning, especially, the relation of teacher and pupil, master and disciple, as we have it here under consideration, necessarily clothes this subjective side of the process with the largest amount of such self-determining freedom. College students are expected to take a far more independently active part in their own education, than children in the nursery or boys in the common school. Indeed their education is a failure, if it do not bring them continually more and more to be a law unto themselves, to do their own thinking and to will their own working. They cannot be educated to any extent successfully, without their own free consent and active co-operation. In a very large and deep sense it may be said of them always that they must educate themselves.

All such owe it to themselves to take this thought into earnest consideration. There is a side of the great work in which they are engaged, which belongs of course to their teachers. The relation of master and pupil can never be what it ought to be, if the master have not the true spirit of his office. Dull teachers are sure to make dull students; as dull, lifeless preachers also put whole congregations to sleep. The college professor must be himself awake (a living fountain and not a dead pool of learning only), if either black-board or crucible, text-book or lecture, is to have any waking sense for his class. But it is just as true on the other side, that the relation of master to disciple never can be what it ought to be, if the disciple also has not the true spirit of *his* office. The power of communication everywhere needs for its completion the correlative power of reception. Without this it stagnates and becomes waste. Good students help powerfully to make good teachers. The best inspiration a faithful instructor can have in his work, is that which is made to flow in upon him from the wakeful attention and sympathetic intelligence, and loving confidence of the pupils who sit at his feet, and drink in the words of wisdom that proceed from his lips.

The great matter all round is to understand, and keep stea-

dily in view, the great end of all right education; something, which it is to be feared, is largely lost sight of in our educational schemes at this time. Education is, in general terms, the development of man's ethical and spiritual being. But this may be directed to different purposes and ends. It may be ordered in such a way as to subordinate the powers of the soul to purely physical and material interests. It may look in the direction, sometimes of one science and sometimes of another. It may have for its object practical pursuits, the necessities of common secular business, under all imaginable various forms. But it is plain that through all this multiplication of possible partial ends, good or bad, there must be one supreme end answering to the universal idea of humanity, a so-called "chief end of man," in harmony with which alone it can be possible for the development of his life to be at all normal or true to its own original constitution. This end is determined at once by our human nature itself: and as soon as it is apprehended, it sets before us what must necessarily be regarded as the absolute and last sense of all education. It is the perfecting of the spiritual existence of its subjects. It is, in one word, the development of a true vigorous personal life, answerable to the relations and conditions under which it is brought to pass. The chief end of man, the Westminster Catechism tells us, is to glorify God, and to enjoy Him forever. This is true; but it comes to the same thing in the end, when we say that the chief end of every man is to realize the proper idea of humanity in his own person and to be a man in the right and full sense of the term.

The personality of a man is not just his self-consciousness, with its powers of reason and will; it is this wrought into ethical volume and form (the proper conception of *character*) through its own free action. As such it stands in the exercise of reason and will; but it is immeasurably more than any particular property, faculty, or force, embraced in their exercise. It is the sum total of what the man makes of himself in the great work on which he is put of raising his nature, the original base of his being, into the region of intelligence and freedom. This is

not development strictly speaking, but construction. The process is architectonic. In a profound, awful sense, every man is the architect of his own person; he builds himself, year after year, into spiritual being. What he shall be in this way in himself, then, and not in anything beyond himself, is for him the one great problem of life, the one great purpose of all right education. It is a great thing to know this; and it is a still greater thing to hold it continually in view; so that a man shall reverence the idea of his own nature, and make supreme account of completing it in all his ways. Directed toward this object, and only as thus directed, education becomes worthy of its name. This is more than all merely outward knowing or doing; more than all simply professional or technical business skill. We have no wish to undervalue these in their proper place. But wisdom, we say with Solomon, is the principal thing. Let us therefore get wisdom; and with all our getting, let us get understanding. For "wisdom is better than rubies, and all things that may be desired are not to be compared to it. The merchandise of it is better than the merchandise of silver, and the gain thereof than fine gold."

ART. II.—THE SACRAMENTAL ENERGIES OF THE CHURCH,  
THE HIGHER MIRACLES OF GRACE.

---

BY REV. P. S. DAVIS, A. M., CHAMBERSBURG, PA.

---

THE idlest dreamer along the stream of history cannot fail to notice the fact, that error is prone to run into dialectic extremes. The Gnosticism denounced as anti-christ by St. John, is followed by Arianism in succeeding centuries; and Eutychianism seems to grow up out of zeal against Nestorianism. So throughout: whenever the Church has promulgated her dogma against one heresy, another of an opposite character has always appeared.

The fact that errors in doctrine and practice have sprung up in the bosom of the Church, is no argument against the presence of a Divine Person and an Infallible Teacher. Though Divine in her whole constitution, she has to do with our fallen human life, and was not to be placed beyond the reach or influence of evil by any outward magical power. The moral nature of the promised triumph involved a real antagonism with the Kingdom of Satan, in which the "mystery of iniquity" was to work side by side with the "mystery of grace;"—the Kingdom of Heaven itself being like a net that was to gather of every kind, and a field in which an enemy might sow tares. Through fire and flood, through the blood of martyrdom\* as well as of atonement, through earnest struggles after truth as well as enlightenment by the Holy Ghost, through present conflict as well as final catastrophe, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from Heaven with His mighty angels, she is at last to be presented "without spot or wrinkle or any such thing."

In some instances, it has required a long period of time for a particular evil tendency to develop itself, and at last it has

---

\* Acts xiv. 22; Rom v. 3; Rev. vii. 14.

gained such force that, to those engaged in the contest for truth, the issue may have seemed doubtful; but it is wonderful to see the power the Church has shown to repel and eliminate error. The long vista of the past is strewn with the wrecks of heresy, schism and abuse, that, vaunting themselves, have at last been thrown off to their own destruction. The Church has thus proven herself to be not only the preserver of all truth, but the power by which sin is "ever coming to an end." This fact should be borne in mind by all modern Donatists, who, in their disposition to carp or to despond, are ever ready to ask "Sir, didst thou not sow good seed in thy field?"

In looking at the present state of the Church, we are to remember that, although in a very important sense history never repeats itself, yet its elements and tendencies are always the same. Generations come and go before its long-drawn processes reach their legitimate issue, and it is never given to any age to understand itself. The appalling confusion by which we are now surrounded, is evidence enough that the present condition of the church is parenthetical and not her final state of unity, holiness and peace. How and when the difficulties that meet us on every hand are to be solved, no man can now tell. That God will bring Her out of the wilderness, no one can doubt. But He moves through history as the gods of Homer are said to have moved through space. He takes a step, and ages have passed. The great pendulum of time swings once, and centuries are gone.

Meanwhile the question arises, Where do we stand? Are we in right relations, and are our activities in the right direction? Is there no whirlpool into which we may be unconsciously drawn, in our very efforts to avoid the rock on which those of past ages have split? These are solemn questions, in answering which, many earnest men are expressing their well-grounded convictions that our modern pseudo-protestantism is now on the tidal wave which bids fair to engulf us in the vortex of rationalism and infidelity. This is the result of an undue reactionary movement, brought about by the abuses we find in the Church before the reformation of the xvith century. That

there were abuses at that time, calling for reform, the most learned and devoted prelates of the Roman Church do not pretend to deny. The Church was then looked upon by many as a mere outward authority, to which all must blindly submit, under penalty of purgatory, or of hell itself. The keys of St. Peter were brandished for mere personal or political purposes; and the Holy Sacraments were used in the way that Simon Magus would have used them, if he had obtained what he wanted at the hands of the Apostles. The clergy had become secularized and corrupt, and all the means of grace had been perverted and profaned, so that the "words of institution" were so hurriedly recited by irreverent priests as to become "*Hocus pocus*,"\* and the mystery of the forgiveness of sins was made a matter of the merest mercantile barter. All of this called for protest, and properly demanded reform. We have here one of those extremes of which we have spoken as characteristic of history in its zigzag course—the Scylla, in avoiding which, we are in danger of Charybdis.

Since that time, the growing tendency has been to regard the Church as of no account whatever. Many look upon her, as Zöilus looked upon the poem he is said to have brought to Apollo, only as covered with faults—a miserable failure, and they would sooner turn to any thing else for hope or comfort. True, they have never acquiesced in the world's evil as the world's law. Their lives are a protest against this, but their hope of relief seems to be in a reconstruction of the elements and factors now at hand in the disorganized order of the world itself. The general disposition is to make the civilization of the age, in one or another of its forms, the main reliance. Systems of philosophy, schemes of government, philanthropic movements, all lying in the order of the world's fallen life, are largely depended upon. With a large class, physical science is "the only sure thing," and we hear much from them of "the immutable laws of Nature." Man's footsteps are already heard to resound in her penetralia. He has pressed his ardent

---

\* An evident contraction of "*Hoc est corpus meum*."



inquiries upon her, till she has reluctantly yielded up her secrets to him; and now, big cities with Nicholson pavements, steam ships, rail roads, telegraphs, and nitro-glycerine proclaim the dawn of a golden era. No wonder that they whose faith is in this outward material prosperity, should be indifferent to a supernatural order of grace, and leave the ark with the lords of the Philistines, while they contend about the golden mice at Ashdod.

But there are thousands of others, many of them acknowledged ministers of the Most High, who can see the Lamb's Bride only as the Scarlet woman, and a believer in Sacramental grace only in the light of a sympathizer with the Pope, if not with Beelzebub himself. They seem to rest in that mere *negation* which makes it a matter of fixed creed, *not* to believe any thing that was held as truth before the Reformation; and, to be consistent, they ought to repudiate the Crucifixion, as an article of faith peculiar to the Church of Rome. This is conserving the interests of Protestantism, with a vengeance! Let people talk about Romanizing tendencies as much as they please, but Pius IX. has no more effectual allies than those who yield to the Papacy, not only the name of "Catholic" and the use of the hallowed cross, but all the attributes with which Christ endowed His Church. Concede all this to Rome, and the day will come when men will look upon her as alone *possessing* some of those things which the wisdom of God thought necessary to their peace and comfort.

And yet there are those who seem to think that Our Divine Redeemer has evaporated into the clouds, leaving nothing to represent Him on the earth, and that even the Comforter, whom He promised should abide with us forever, has left the world, and is to be called down on special occasions "as He was on the day of Pentecost." \* Of course the holy ministry is a mere profession, and the Sacraments empty, if not useless forms,

---

\* A correspondent of a religious paper giving a glowing account of a revival in a western city says that the Holy Ghost was in that place "two whole hours" on a certain evening. Where, we reverently ask, did the Adorable Spirit go to when the two hours were over? And if He departed what became of the good work?

though our Saviour solemnly instituted them to be of force for all time. Belief in any thing more than this, has come to be regarded by some persons as *prima facie* evidence against any man's personal piety. For popular religious sentiment has given this verdict; that since Charlemagne had the barbarians baptized with a broom, and Tetzel sold indulgences, that which Christ ordained, must be entirely abolished or shorn of its significance, in order to secure the spirituality of all individual men.\*

Popular preaching and popular commentaries which have acquired a traditional authority, starting out with the theory that there can be no mysteries in redemption, have attempted to reduce the sublimest revelations of God to the level of the human understanding, instead of presenting them for faith. † According to them the outward organization of the Kingdom of Grace, is a matter of no consequence; Baptism and the Lord's Supper are merely outward ordinances, and all scripture is of private interpretation.

---

\* The only wonder is that Paul did not, by a parity of reasoning, make the fact that Christ was preached of envy and contention, (Phil. i. 15-16) an argument against preaching the gospel at all.

† For instance, Dr. Adam Clarke, on Luke i. 35. "Therefore, also, that holy thing, which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God." He says among other things, Here I trust I may be permitted to say, with all due respect for those who may differ from me, that the doctrine of the *Eternal Sonship* of Christ is, in my opinion antisciptural, and highly dangerous: this doctrine I reject for the following reasons: 1st I have not been able to find any *express* declaration in the scriptures concerning it.

2dly. If Christ be the Son of God as to His *divine* nature, then he cannot be *eternal*: for *son* implies a *father*; and father implies in reference to *son*, *precedency* in *time*, if not in *nature* too. *Father* and *son* imply the idea of *generation*: and *generation* implies a time in which it was effected, and a time also *antecedent* to such generation.

3dly. If Christ be the Son of God as to His *divine* nature, then the Father is of necessity *prior*, consequently *superior* to Him.

4thly. Again, if this *divine nature* were *begotten* of the Father, then it must be in *time*; i. e. there was a period in which it *did* not exist. This destroys the *eternity* of our blessed Lord and robs Him at once of His Godhead.

5thly. To say that He was *begotten* from all *eternity*, is in my opinion absurd: and the phrase *eternal son* is a positive self-contradiction. *ETERNITY* is that which has had no *beginning* nor stands in any reference to *TIME*. *SON* supposes *time*, *generation*, and *father*, and time *antecedent* to such generation. Therefore the conjunction of these two terms *son* and *eternity* is absolutely impossible, as they imply essentially different and *opposite* ideas." The italics, &c. are Dr. Clarke's. Vide Com. in loc.

Shades of the *Symbolum quicunque*, what would old Athanasius have said to that? Or which side, we may ask would Dr. Clarke have taken in the fight with Arius.

The apparent success of all that has been done in this way for Christ is, in a large measure, not because the world has been raised up to the Kingdom of God, but because the Kingdom of God has been lowered to the world, whose wild surgent waves have already not only borne down all landmarks of the Reformation, but submerged the eternal verities of universal creed.

That is no proper compensation for all this in the appeals these men make to the Bible, because the Kingdom of grace itself, of which the Bible gives us the inspired account, is ignored. Men might as well profess to find comfort in the pamphlet laws of a state, if their whole supposition was that the state itself had no existence. Unless the state be a concrete reality,—an organization from which laws may emanate, and with powers vested in men for their administration; any written code, however good, would of course be the purest fiction.\* And we find that those people who ignore the underlying fact of God's Kingdom, of which the Scriptures are the Divine record, are not generally helped in their ideas by finding Christ always speaking in that record of that Kingdom as a reality. The Kingdom of Great Britain, with Victoria on the throne, or even the Kingdom of Israel, with David on the throne, they can conceive of as an *entity*. But somehow or other, the Kingdom of Grace, with Christ at its head, is always thought of as an inpalpable Gnostic myth; and all that St. Paul ever wrote about "gifts," "governments," "helps," and "administrations," † fails to impress them with the fact that the Ascension gift of our Saviour ever contemplated any outward organization, with institutions and powers to carry on His work on the earth.

As might be expected, any evidence that the sacraments were designed to impart a life to man or to sustain it in him, is ruled out none the less certainly because it is found in the Scriptures. The declaration of Christ to Nicodemus (Jno. iii. 2-5)

---

\* Think of any distressed citizen finding practical comfort in reading Sir Thos. More's account of Utopia!

† Rom. xii. 6-8; 1 Cor. xii. 4-11; Eph. iv. 7-16.

that not mere teaching, but the germ of a new life imparted by a Divine act, through a form of His own instituting, is absolutely necessary to any one entering the Kingdom of God, is made to refer to some purely subjective state to which a man must come through conscious exercises of his own. This interpretation seems to have been thought necessary to guard men against some superstitious or false reliance to which Christ Himself has exposed him, and to secure more effectually than our Saviour would have done it, what is called a "change of heart." And this traditional interpretation has been so generally adopted that any one who takes side with the Saviour may expect a hot issue with the religionists of the day, in which he will be charged with a reckless disregard for the souls of his fellow-creatures. No one of those who have a "repetition of Pentecont" during the long evenings of each succeeding winter, \* and who are accustomed to the cry "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" would wish or dare to answer in the language of St. Peter, "*Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of your sins, and ye shall receive the Holy Ghost.*" † And this is not because this advice is not found in the Bible, but because it seems evident to the unsacramental mind, from the whole apostolic commission and the inspired words here used, that baptism has nothing to do with the remission of sins and the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the same reason, such a one would never think of saying to any seeker what Ananias said to Saul, "And now why tarriest thou? arise and be baptized, and *wash away thy sins*, calling on the name of the Lord." ‡ The fact is, that to his unchurchly view, this sacrament has no efficacy in washing away sin, direct passages of Scripture to the contrary notwithstanding.

And direct passages of Scripture do not prevent the same low views of the Blessed Eucharist. The Saviour's solemn

---

\* A very good man spoke some time ago of a revival which was as "good as could be expected in warm weather." As if the operations of the Blessed Spirit were limited by that.

† Acts ii. 37, 38.

‡ Acts xxii. 16.

words, "*This is my body*,"\* are explained to mean "This is not My body, in any proper sense." St. Paul's challenge, "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" † is made to imply a negative answer. The same apostle, in delivering that which he had received, says, "This is the New Testament in my blood; this do as often as ye drink it in remembrance of me. *For*," that is *because*, "as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, *ye do show the Lord's death until He come.*" ‡ But this is made to teach that the communion is intended only to stir up the mind by way of remembrance, and that the central mystery of Christ's sacrifice has *no perennial force, reaching forward through all time*. So, too, when he says, "He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, *not discerning the Lord's body*," § the general supposition is, that we are to be condemned for *not discerning that which is in no sense present in the mystery*. Indeed, notwithstanding our Lord's most solemn re-affirmation, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of man, ye have no life in you," || it is often and openly said that it makes no difference whether a man ever partakes of this sacrament or not.

Most remarkable of all is the fact that many, even of those who plead for sacramental grace, grow tremulous and unbelieving, when men are made the stewards of these mysteries. Any idea of such investiture is rejected; as though our Divine Redeemer, having ordained means of grace in His Church, had delegated no powers to His ministry for their administration. It is of no use to argue against this low view from the Constitution of the Church itself, which, if not an abstract idea, must take real form, and have men ordained to execute its provisions; for the plea is, as usual, that this is not a Church, but a Bible question. And yet the Bible not only takes the living ministry

---

\* Matt. xxvi. 26.

† 1 Cor. x. 16.

‡ 1 Cor. xi. 23, 26.

§ Verse 29.

|| St. John vi. 53.

for granted as preceding it in the nature of the case, and speaks in oft-repeated unequivocal terms of "the laying on of hands" as the God-ordained mode by which men are vested with office, but also sets forth the fact that vicarious powers, the most awfully grand and transcendently mysterious, have been given to men. We cite the following passages on this point: "And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." \* "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth on Me, the works that I do shall he do also: and greater works than these shall he do; because I go unto My Father." † "Then said Jesus unto them again, Peace be unto you: as My Father hath sent Me, even so I send you. And when He had said this, He breathed on them and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained." ‡ "All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of (*μαθητεύσατε*) all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen." § "He that receiveth you receiveth Me; and he that receiveth Me receiveth Him that sent me." ||

These words will be recognized as the most startling declarations found any where, even in the Bible itself. They bear directly on the powers and functions of the Christian ministry, and the mere charge that Rome may have arrogated to herself and presumptuously used these powers, does not take the declarations out of the Bible. Independently of any consequent curse (Rev. xxii. 19), no man can, without opening the sacred canon to a general expurgation, in which every one might claim a say, affirm that, because these words may not be true

\* Matt. xvi. 19.

† John xiv. 12.

‡ John xx. 21, 23.

§ Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.

|| Matt. x. 40.

in a certain given sense, they are not true in *any* sense. \* And yet, here are most solemn asseverations of Christ, which many persons wish to get rid of entirely. And the point we wish to make is this: That the attitude of these persons towards all the passages we have quoted in the course of this article, shows that *they stand as much in doubt of the words of the Bible as they do of the fact of the Church.* And this for the simple reason that the statements of the one and the concrete existence of the other are in perfect accord. There is no conflict between them. They stand or fall together. He who denies the underlying fact answering to a record, always turns the record itself into a fable, and it is only when men have perverted the true conception of the Church that they must drag down the Scriptures to a level with their own false notions.

---

\* The doctrine of the remission and the retention of sins by the Church was certainly held by the reformers. For instance, in an old book formerly believed in by Presbyterians, we find the following: "Dominus Iesus quatenus Rex et caput Ecclesie sue constituit in ea regimen, quod in officiariorum Ecclesiasticorum manu foret, distinctum a civili Magistratu. Officiariis hisce claves regni celorum sunt commissae, quarum virtute obtinent potestatem peccata vel retinendi vel remittendi pro varia peccantium conditione; impenitentibus quidem regnum illud tam per verbum quam per censuras ocludendi, peccatoribus vero penitentibus tam evangelii ministerio quam absolute a censuris idem aperiendi, prout occasio postulaverit." — *Collectio Confessionum* Ed. Niemeyer. Appendix, pps. 42, 43.

A most excellent and literal translation of this is published by authority of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States. It runs thus: "The Lord Jesus, as King and head of His Church, hath therein appointed a government in the hand of Church officers, distinct from the civil magistrate. To these officers the keys of the kingdom of heaven are committed, by virtue whereof they have power respectively to RETAIN AND REMIT SINS, TO SHUT THAT KINGDOM against the impenitent, both by the word and CENSURES; AND TO OPEN IT unto penitent sinners, by the ministry of the Gospel, AND BY ABSOLUTION from censures, as the occasion shall require." — *Confession of Faith*, chap. xxx.

The italics, etc., are our own, but the text supported in the way of marginal references by the very Scriptures we have quoted stands "unto this day." Surely the Westminster divines had no disposition to hand the keys over to the "pretended only successor of St. Peter," and the General Assembly in this country, in 1821 and 1833, showed no willingness to modify this declaration, to suit the "growing wants of the age." The same idea of Church government was set forth in the symbolical books of the Lutheran and Reformed Churches, about a century earlier, as it would be easy to show. We quote the above, however, as sufficient, and as having the supposed merit of being farther removed from the Reformation itself in point of time than the others. Can we as Reformed be blamed for believing what the Reformers themselves taught? Are there Romanizing tendencies in the Westminster Confession? If so, who then is safe?



Instead of quoting other particular passages, we note the fact that the line of demarkation between what such men receive and what they reject is drawn *just where the objective mysteries of grace come in*. With the general structure of the sacred writings, this temper of mind will have nothing to do; but even direct and special statements are thrown into the crucible of private opinion, that everything like grace through a channel of God's own appointment may be burned out as so much hay, wood, and stubble, with which Christ and His apostles have overlaid the true foundation. It can see how men should *repent* for the remission of sins, but that they should be *baptized* for any such object savors of superstition. It can say, with Nicodemus, "How can these things be?" and with the Jews, "This is a hard saying, who can hear it?" but it would sooner "walk with Christ no more," than to accept what He affirms and re-affirms with His own double "Verily." Anything that has to do with the subjective states of man, or any motion from man to God-ward, seems all right; but anything coming from God to man-ward is promptly repudiated, if it is at all mediated by a ministry and sacraments. And yet it is just from the Divine side that everything like *help* must come. The fact is, that men generally are ready to adopt what seems patent to the human understanding. The mysteries that challenge *faith* are, of course, ignored. This is the unmitigated rationalism which, though not organized into avowed schools, is spreading its mildew blight over almost the entire Protestant world. And it is of no use to deny the fact, that whole denominations are standing upon such a steep and slippery descent, that it is easy enough for them to fall over into the abyss of infidelity. It is easy enough to see, too, that, sooner or later, men will become conscious of this, and that, unless something better presents itself than our reigning Protestantism, many will go to Rome from a conceived necessity. \*

---

\* A "great commoner" lately deceased, who had all his life the loosest ideas of the Church, was constrained at last by a sense of want to be baptized by a Sister of Mercy. This is only one of many instances that are occurring all over the world. It is just from this class of persons that Rome receives her largest accessions.

Those who would conserve the truth, and keep men from straying into the cold, bleak regions of unbelief on the one hand, or running into errors that required protest and reform in times past, must *keep the faith* once delivered to the saints, and not abandon it upon every supposed or actual perversion of it, and allow ever-varying public sentiment to make a substitute for it. That faith is not mere credence in a doctrinal system, as though we could be saved by hearty assent to certain notions in the way of thought, but the apprehension of a supernatural power that has apprehended us—a real kingdom which Christ has established in the world and carries forward historically by men and means of His own appointment.

That the apostles consciously stood in the bosom of this supernatural constitution of grace, and wielded the heavenly powers deposited there, men generally would be disposed to admit. But it is affirmed that their relation to the Church was extraordinary, and that they were endowed with extraordinary gifts to which the Church can make no pretension now. The main argument for this, is the signs and wonders that accompanied their ministry. "Show us a miracle," men now say, "and we will believe."

It is just with this demand that we join issue. For the demand is not only not made to authenticate the *prophetical* functions of the ministry, which was mainly witnessed by the apostles' miracles, but it would measure every higher spiritual operation by the test of a manifestation of a lower class of powers. God has never thus bound the supreme law of His life and grace, and man has no right to ask that what is intended to be apprehended by faith, should be supplemented by evidences palpable to the senses. Indeed, what are commonly called miracles have not characterized the whole period of history of which we have an inspired record. They occur only in groups, at particular epochs, with centuries between them, so that the mere lapse of time is no positive proof against their recurrence. And if the interests of the kingdom of Christ ever demand that the "lying wonders"\* now surrounding us and

---

\* 2 Thess. ii. 9.

threatening to deceive the very elect into a transfer of their trust from Jehovah to the "prince of darkness," should be overmatched in an outward way, as in the times of Moses and Elijah, God will not leave Himself without the proper witness. The rod that is to eat up all the other rods, and the fire that is to consume the sacrifice will not be withheld.

But the mere absence of outward miracles has never been evidence against the on-goings of the kingdom of God. Many a sacrifice has been acceptably offered in the field of the Church when there was no attesting angel going up, as from the altar of Manoah, and many a battle has been won for God when there was no sign like that which marked the fleece of Gideon.

It is Bacon's maxim that the best times to live in are the worst to read about, *i. e.*, the worst for entertainment, as affording the least variety of incident. This is true in its measure, of the Church. It is wrong to suppose that her days of miracles were her best days. They have always been days of sore temptation, persecution and distress,—hours of travail in which she was to bring forth something higher and better. When Jesus was manifested to destroy the works of the devil, He came into awful conflict with all the powers of darkness. He rebuked the devils in the storm and cast them out of men. He healed the sick and raised the dead. But these particular acts of His power were mere premonitions or outflashings of a Divine energy He had brought into the service of our humanity for the relief of *all* its woes. And this was to be effected, not by mere outward healings, but by taking away *sin*—the primal source of all our miseries. The inward spiritual being of man was then the region for the display of Christ's highest powers. It was more to say "Thy sins be forgiven thee" than to say "Arise, take up thy bed and walk." So our Lord Himself regarded it, and He always discouraged in others the disposition to exalt the outward to the depression of the inward. The seventy were to rejoice that their names were written in heaven, rather than that the devils were subject to them.

Indeed, the relative power and importance of the two classes of miracles were such that visible signs and wonders were but

the concomitancies of the inauguration of the kingdom of Grace. That kingdom was *itself* to be the standing miracle of the world, and the powers vested in the Church were to be heaven's permanent grant for the overcoming of sin and Satan. The holy ministry, with its Word and Sacraments, was to remain after the signs and wonders had ceased.

It makes no difference *when* what men regard as miraculous powers seemed to depart from the Church. Whether they were performed with the bones of St. Stephen in the fourth century, \* or with the relics of St. Cuthbert in the seventh, † or whether they ceased with the apostles, is nothing to our point. Nor does it make any difference by *whom* they were performed. What we wish to call attention to is the fact that Christ spoke of greater works than *His own miracles*, and promised His disciples power to perform them. This He did in so many words in one of the passages we have already quoted, ‡ and this He implied in all those other utterances conferring prerogatives so transcendent that they seem to belong only to God.

That these words were addressed to those who were to bear office in His Church is evident, from the fact that He was alone with His disciples when He uttered them. The only question then is, *what were* the "greater works" they were to do? A consideration of this question may help to elucidate our subject.

That the power to work even the lower class of miracles here referred to was not given to every simple believer is clear enough. St. Paul tells us that "To one was given by the Spirit the word of wisdom \* \* \* \* to another the *working of miracles*," § as though there were a distribution of gifts; and St. Stephen is distinguished for his miracles as though they were peculiar to him. || But to the twelve and the seventy the power to do all miracles was given at an early stage of Christ's ministry, and before He committed to them any spiritual or priestly charge. The four classes of miracles enumerated (Matt. x. 8;

---

\* St. Augustine says he saw miracles performed with the bones of St. Stephen, during his Bishopric at Hippo.

† Bede's Ecclesiastical Hist., chap. xxxi.

‡ John xiv. 12.

§ 1 Cor. xii. 8-10.

|| Acts vi. 8.

Luke ix. 1; x. 9) included all that Christ Himself ever did, even to the raising of the dead, and beyond this it was impossible to go. There could, then, be no greater works of the same kind. Our Divine Redeemer could only, therefore, have meant that works of equal power, but of a higher order, were to be performed by His disciples. A declaration in which similar language is used has been cited by another in support of this interpretation: "Every one that hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for My name's sake shall receive an hundredfold, and shall inherit eternal life." \* Here the hundredfold refers not to any future reward, because from that it is expressly distinguished. It refers to a recompense in this world, but in things of a higher spiritual nature. So too, we may conclude, that the greater things than Christ's visible miracles which the disciples were to perform, refer to "those works of power which the ministry of the Church effects in the spiritual class of her operations," and this gives us at once her sacramental energy.

This sacramental energy was to be put forth in the official acts of the Holy ministry. The facts in the case bear us out in this assertion. We have already referred to the fact that power to perform the lower classes of miracles was given to the disciples at a comparatively early period in the personal ministry of Christ. They were to cure all manner of bodily diseases, when sent forth simply to preach the Kingdom, that is, when they were sent forth to announce and proclaim that the fullness of time had come, and that the Messiah had indeed been manifested for the salvation of the world. The kingdom of heaven was, indeed, *just at hand*, and had come *nigh* unto men; † but those great redemptive acts by which Christ was to establish and vindicate this kingdom—that triumphant rule—was yet in the future. His death, resurrection, and ascension were necessary, before the Church, with its full constitution and privileges, could be founded. Hence, so many of His teachings are prospective, not intended, indeed, to take effect

---

\* Matt. xix. 29.

† See note on page 36.

in institutions and powers until He was declared to be the Son of God by the resurrection from the dead, and had ascended up on high, giving gifts unto men. \*

It is often shown in separate instances, that particular sayings of our Lord subsequent to His resurrection were the fulfillments, or rather the enactments of things promised in His earlier teachings; or, what is the same thing, the words spoken in His earlier teachings waited for His resurrection and ascension, before they gained their full force and meaning. In this connection, we call attention to the fact *that the Church's entire charter was given after the resurrection*. If there are any sayings of importance to the children of God, they are those uttered by our Redeemer between the time that He rose from the dead and the time that He ascended into Heaven. Having now made an open show of His triumph, He makes provision for the dispensation of His grace among men. As one about to go to a far country, He commits these mysteries to stewards.† They were to do "greater works" because as he said "I go unto my Father." They must have no doubt about His triumph, and must have especial instruction and authority from Him. "Not to all the people but unto witnesses chosen before of God,"‡ "He showed Himself alive after His passion by many infallible proofs, being seen of them forty days, and speaking of things pertaining to the KINGDOM of God." "Then opened He their understandings, that they might understand the Scriptures, and said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day: and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. § It was near the close of these forty mysterious days, too, that Jesus "said to them again, Peace be unto you: as the Father hath sent me, even so I send you. And when he had said this, he breathed on them and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: Whosoever sins ye remit, they

---

\* Eph. iv. 8.

† Acts x. 41.

‡ 1 Cor. iv. 1.

§ Acts i. 3.

are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain they are retained." \*

In full character with this is the apostolic commission familiar to all. It has three distinguishing features: a) While the first commission to the twelve and the seventy, although attested by miracles, was simply the announcement of a Kingdom "at hand" and "nigh unto men," this authorized the apostles to make disciples, that is, Christ was not only to be nigh unto them, *but formed in them* the hope of glory. † b) This was to be through a sacramental act administered by the apostles. "Go ye, make disciples, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." c) This was linked on to the power of God. "All power is given to me in Heaven and earth, Go ye therefore."

Now if this has any force at all, every act of this ministry, accompanied by the power of the Holy Ghost, is a greater work than the performance of any outward miracle. To this order of Grace all the mighty works of Christ and His apostles looked as their object and end. † The justice and truth of this classification of the powers of the world to come, which makes the Divine energies in the sacraments to transcend all others in importance and permanency, will be obvious if we suppose it to be reversed. Suppose that the highest end of Christ's ministry had been the healing of men's bodily maladies; and that all the mighty works that He did had had their end in themselves? Suppose that the plan of salvation set forth in the Bible were withdrawn from the world, and another given in its place, in which the forgiveness of sins and eternal life were displaced by mere wonder works in the outward world, to be continued for all time for the healing of men's physical dis-

---

\* Luke xxiv. 45-47. *NOTE*.—Any thing that Christ did Himself directly during His earthly ministry (Matt. ix. 2; Luke vii. 47) is altogether a different thing. What we have to do with now is the various *missions* He gave. Any one not jaundiced by prejudice must see a difference and an advance in these, even as far as any prophetic function is concerned. It is evident from the above passage that the death and resurrection of Christ were necessary in order that repentance and the *remission of sins* should be even *preached among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem*.

† John xx. 21-23.



eases? Any one must see that the necessities of man's case would not have been reached. These maladies would have been continually recurring, for there would have been no extracting of the bitter root of sin, from which they ever must grow. To take away, not simply a particular *consequence* of sin, but *sin itself* was requisite to man's salvation. For this object Christ came into the world, and for this was required the display of His highest power. Wonderfully great is that article of faith, "I believe in the forgiveness of sins." God might have continued to part waters and increase food, and heal diseases and raise the dead, through His prophets, as of old; but to purge away man's guilt required the Incarnation of His Son; an awful expiation on the cross, and all the omnipotent energies of the Holy Ghost.

Nor can any one who studies the structure of the Church, or reads God's Word attentively, be blind to the fact that He has linked these higher supernatural powers of His grace, to the official acts of men. In the very nature of the case, the forgiveness of sins stands just where it is placed in the Apostles' Creed, as flowing out of the Holy Catholic Church and the Communion of Saints. There, is just where St. John puts it, in a memorable sentence, only one half of which, it is generally thought necessary, to quote.\*

Indeed, we find no evidence in the word of God that we are now to expect out-pourings of the Holy Spirit, such as marked the day of Pentecost. Men might as well expect a re-incarnation of the Second Person of the adorable Trinity to answer individual demands. The Comforter was to abide with us forever.† Nor is there any evidence in the Bible that God ever granted a new life to any individual, independently of the organization of the Church.‡ He not only never revoked the

\* In his first Epistle chap. ii. ver. 7, he says "But if we walk in the light as He is in the light, we have fellowship with one another, and the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin."

† John xiv. 16.

‡ The idea of praying to God to convert the heathen, without our sending them the ministry or the word in some form, as though we could expect Him to reveal Himself to them directly from Heaven, must be absurd even to the most unchurchly mind.

commission given to His disciples, but regarded its permanency so sacred, that He would never contravene or supplant it. The three cases sometimes quoted as against this assertion, are the very ones that prove it. The first case is that of the eunuch of Ethiopia. In his history, we find that the angel did tell *Philip* to go to the South; the Spirit did tell him to join the chariot, and when he had instructed and baptized the eunuch, the apostle was borne away perhaps miraculously to Azotus. But God did not interpose with that same miraculous power to bring the eunuch into a saving relation to Him without Philip, even though the eunuch had the open Bible in his hand. \* The second case is that of Saul of Tarsus, the circumstances of whose calling were certainly extraordinary. He was arrested on the heights overlooking Damascus, and brought into direct interview with the Great Head of the Church Himself. A voice said, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? And he said, Who art Thou, Lord? and the Lord said, I am Jesus, whom thou persecutest." \* \* \* "And he, trembling and astonished, said, Lord, what wilt Thou have me to do?" But Christ instead of telling him directly, said, "Arise, *go into the city*, and it shall be told thee what thou must do." Meanwhile Ananias was advised, in a vision, of his coming. He went to the house of Judas, as directed, and putting his hand on him, said, "Brother Saul, the Lord, even Jesus, that appeared to thee in the way as thou camest, hath sent *me*, that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the *Holy Ghost*, and immediately there fell from his eyes, as it had been scales, and he arose and was baptized."† The third case is that of Cornelius. He was told in a vision by an angel that his prayers and his alms had come up as a memorial before God. But instead of having the Gospel preached to him in that vision, he is directed to "send to Joppa for Peter; *he* shall tell thee what thou oughtest to do." And it was only by the preaching of Peter, and a Sacrament received at his hands, that this devout man was brought into saving relations to Christ. †

\* Acts viii.

† Acts chap. ix. 1-9.

‡ Acts, chap. x.

Here, then in these special cases so minutely recorded, we have not only visions and angels, but direct interviews with Jesus Himself, and directions from the Holy Spirit,—all that men think would obviate the necessity of a Church, used to bring earnest inquirers into contact with the Apostles. Here, where exceptions might have been expected, if ever, Our Divine Redeemer would not disregard His original organization. He did not even instruct the eunuch, or Saul, or Cornelius, independently of those He had commissioned “to do and to teach.” It was only when His apostles taught, that the Spirit came upon these men for their enlightenment, and when thus enlightened, it was only by a God ordained sacrament administered by anointed ones, that any of them were made disciples.

This, again, all stands in strange contrast with the modern Christianity, which thinks it necessary to do away with all of God’s ordinances in order to a more spiritual communion with Him. It rebukes the presumption that talks about what God might have done and may do; for it is certainly better Christianity to accept what God *has* done. Suppose that St. Paul, in this spirit had affirmed that God could reveal Christ without the ministry of the word, and had failed to preach the gospel; or that he had dispensed with the sacraments as useless, or told Timothy that there was no gift in him by the laying on of hands of presbytery,—would he have come down to us distinguished for greater spirituality? The thought is almost blasphemous.

We find no such record in the Bible. The apostles evidently believed that they had received “power from on high,” and that spiritual gifts were communicated in those outward transactions which God had ordained for the communication of such great grace. They not only preached the gospel, but baptized the nations for the remission of their sins,\* and declared as the veriest fact that as many as were baptized in the name of Christ had put on Christ. † They fed those who had been born of the water and the Spirit, not with sentimental advice, but with the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharistic mys-

---

\* Acts ii. 37, 38; xxii. 16. † Gal. iii. 27.

tery, and if any failed to *discern* the Lord's body, they plainly told them, "For *this cause* many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep." \* As teachers taught of God, they did not hesitate to say to the congregations in Antioch, Syria and Cilicia, "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost *and to us*. † Nay more, they rebuked "with all authority" ‡ at one time delivering some to Satan that they might learn not to blaspheme, § and at another, restoring such as were penitent, || with full assurance that their binding and loosing were ratified in heaven. All this can be explained only on the ground that the apostles had been themselves translated by some apprehending mystery from the kingdom of darkness to the kingdom of God's dear Son, and wielded instrumentalities for the manifestation of God's highest power. That these higher powers were merely delegated, all must admit. In this they stand on exactly the same level with the powers that healed the bodies of men. The apostles were the mere instruments in the one case as well as in the other, but they were none the less the instruments in the greater works Christ sent them to do. This was the ground of their humility. They magnified their *office*, and were less liable to push their dark shadows between the people and the golden light that streamed from the Eternal Throne.

In view of all these things, the question that solemnly propounds itself is this: If Christ made divine energies inherent to the laws and institutions of His grace; and if the apostles, notwithstanding the wondrous power that accompanied their *preaching*, used the sacraments as efficacious, what right have we to class them among carnal ordinances and regard their administration mere wholesome customs? It may be because wonders seem to have ceased. But it has been pertinently asked by a well-known writer on this subject ¶ "What is the new birth in Baptism, and the communion of Christ's body and blood in the Holy Eucharist, and the life of God in the soul and the kingdom of heaven in the world, what are these

---

\* 1 Cor. xi. 29, 30. † Acts xv. 28.

‡ Titus ii. 15. § 1 Tim. i. 20. || Gal. vi. 1. ¶ Trench on Miracles, pp. 50, 51.

but every one of them wonders? \* \* \* \* How meanly do we esteem of a Church, of its marvelous gifts, of the powers of the coming world which are working within it, of its Word, of its Sacraments, when it seems to us a small thing that in it men are new-born, raised from the death of sin to the life of righteousness, the eyes of their understanding enlightened, and their ears opened, unless we can also tell of more visible and sensuous wonders. It is as though the heavens should not declare to us the glory of God, nor the firmament show us His handiwork, except at some single moment such as that when the sun was standing still upon Gibeon and the moon in Ajalon."

Our Divine Teacher expressly says, "A wicked and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign."\* This was the sin of the Jews. "Except ye *see* signs and wonders ye will not believe,"† said the Saviour to them. "Master, we would *see* a sign from Thee,"‡ they say. This was the lowest kind of belief, and could only lead to the knowledge of that lower class of wonders, which meets the senses. Jesus said to Thomas, "Because thou hast seen Me thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen and yet have believed."§

As might be expected, too, the dynamic force of the Sacraments are hidden from the *understanding*. This was the case even with all those miracles which were accompanied by outward manifestations of power, and by these we can illustrate our points. The blind man, whose sight Christ restored, knew that he was anointed with clay and spittle and that he washed in the pool of Siloam, but the connection between these acts and the opening of his eyes he could not have understood. So we know that the element we use in Holy Baptism is water, and that it is applied in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. But *how* the Spirit operates in that, for the regeneration of man, is beyond human comprehension. There the Saviour left it in His conversation with the ruler of the Jews, and there it must remain. If we understand not earthly

---

\* Matt. xvi. 24.

† Matt. xii. 38.

‡ John iv. 48.

§ John xx. 29.

things how can we understand heavenly things? The Jews themselves were bound to accept deliverances that transcended their highest thoughts, under the old dispensation. When the passover was instituted, they knew that the animal killed was a lamb, that what they caught in the basin and applied to their door-posts was blood, but what connection there was between all this and the passing over of the destroying angel they could not expect to know. Just so in the Eucharist, we know the outward materials we consecrate and eat and drink as bread and wine, but the hidden power by which we are nourished to eternal life in that transaction must ever remain, what the early Church called it, "THE MYSTERY." This mystery, like all others in our Holy Christianity, is presented for faith. "*Faith* is the evidence of things not seen." And it has been beautifully said that, "By this faith alone can the true wonders of God be found; by this only are the real wonders discovered. The Jewish shepherd looked at the manger in Bethlehem, and contemplated its miracles with awe. The heavens had opened to him, and its radiant host had sung for him a wonderful hymn of jubilee; a brilliant star had glided from the east athwart the firmament, and had drawn after it the kings of the earth. But to the Christian eye, the real miracle is, that the child in the manger, between the ox and the ass, is 'true God of true God, begotten, not made, consubstantial to the Father, by whom all things were made.' Before this knowledge, which the sight reveals not, all seen marvels sink into insignificance. When Jesus was brought before Herod, he wished to *see* Him perform a miracle, and Jesus refused to gratify his insolent curiosity. What fitting miracle could He have wrought under such circumstances? He might most justly have struck the profligate idiot with blindness, as St. Paul did Elymas; and it would have been a just punishment, as well as a true sign. Yet a sign was wrought before him, and a wonder that made angels weep with amazement; and we see it, but that worthless infidel did not. It was the eternal Wisdom clad in a fool's coat, and the Son of God, mocked by a stupid rabble of courtiers—and no fire came down from heaven on them. When finally the cross

is raised on Calvary, and the sun is darkened, and the earth quakes, and the mountains are rent, and the veil of the temple is torn, and the dead arise; here surely are miracles and signs enough to satisfy even a Jew's gaping curiosity. But the Christian heeds them not: the greatest of miracles is on that cross. The eclipsing of that Sun of Justice;—the quivering of His frame; the breaking of His heart;—the rending of His humanity;—the death of a God;—absorb all other thoughts and feelings, and make Redemption, the marvel of marvels, alone attended to."

To this we can only add, that when He rose from the dead, and ascended up on high, leading captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men, the great miracle was not in the broken seal, and the receiving cloud and the cloven tongues; but in the fact that He reversed the awful law of death, redeemed our humanity by carrying it to the right hand of God, and constituted "His Church, which is His body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all."\* The Christian cares not to behold with carnal eyes the outward displays with which this mystery was inaugurated. These might pass away, but the mystery remains; and his faith is in the constitution of grace itself. In it, men are born of God and nourished to life eternal; and the God-ordained Word and Sacraments are the channels of a far higher power than that which hushed the storm and healed the bodies of men.

This our Saviour taught; and this the Apostles, Fathers and Reformers believed.

---

\* Eph. i. 23.



ART. III.—THE PERICOPE, OR SELECTIONS OF GOSPELS  
AND EPISTLES FOR THE CHURCH YEAR.

—  
No. III.  
—

BY E. E. HIGBEE, D. D.

WE closed our previous article with the fifth Sunday after Easter. We begin this, therefore, with Ascension day. Of course the selections for this day (the same in all the calendars), take up the fact of the Ascension, as given in the divine record. This was the mystery which gave tone to the whole service, in hymn, and prayer, and homily. It was felt to be too significant to be left to find a subordinate position in the cultus of the Church. It must be brought into clear emphasis by a holy day set apart especially for it. And this shows what great importance the early Church gave to all the great redemptive facts which enter into the Creed. In many sections of Protestantism, where the cultus of the Church has been influenced by the controlling interest of what is merely subjective in Christian life, Ascension Day has fallen entirely out of view in the form of a definite service. We are glad, however, to see it restored in our "Order of Worship," that we may return again to our altars, to celebrate, as did our fathers, the great *Himmelfahrt*.

The day, however, will lose much of its power in the service of the Church, if dislodged from its proper position in the Church Year. What precedes in the selections of the lessons, as we have before remarked, opens the way for the day itself, and forms a bosom of preparation for right meditation upon the mystery with which the day challenges us. So also that which comes after, until Pentecost is reached, is wholly conditioned by what the Ascension lessons have brought into view. A moment's examination will make the truth of this latter statement very apparent. In the selections for Ascension day, not only the fact of the Ascension comes into view, but we have the im-

mediately preceding words of our Saviour, in which the disciples are directed to the great mission, which is to open before them upon the descent of the Holy Ghost. They are commissioned, indeed, to go into all nations and themselves make disciples; and to this end Christ ascends, to pour out upon them the Holy Ghost, and make real in this way His continued presence with them, and in such form as shall clothe them with full powers to accomplish what their commission involves. The disciples, by this conclusion of Christ's forty-days' instruction in things pertaining to the kingdom, and His Ascension then into Heaven, are put into an attitude of expectation, looking forward to a mystery which shall come from that heavenly world into which He ascended, and invest them properly in their office, and inaugurate that kingdom of which He had spoken,—a kingdom which was to be founded upon the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone.

Hence, in the old service, the time intervening between the Ascension and Pentecost was called *Hebdomada Expectationis* (see Du Cange), and the Sunday occurring therein, *Dominica Expectationis*. The whole service of this Sunday, from introit to end, was conditioned by just this, that the Ascension was viewed not as a lasting separation of Christ from the world, but as that mystery which shall open the Heavens for the descending Spirit and the ministry of the Church (fruits of the Ascension), and in the end also for His own return in glory to meet His Bride.

In the gospel for Ascension Day (St. Mark, xvi. 14–20), all this is indicated. St. Mark in his rapid, fervid style, groups the whole into one picture,—the commission, the Ascension, and the session at the right hand of God; and then hurries at once to the necessary conclusion, “And they went forth and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them,” which involves, of course, Christ's presence in the power of the Spirit, who, at the time of the Ascension, was soon to come according to the promise, and therefore was expected by the disciples, and looked for with such prayer and supplications as meet us in the introit of the Sunday following,—“Exaudi, Domine, vocem meam, qua clamavi ad te. Tibi dixit cor meum: Quæsi vultum tuum;

vultum tuum, Domine, requiram. Ne avertas faciem tuam a me."

In the Epistle (Acts i. 1-11), the disciples are commanded by the Saviour not to depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the Promise which should be fulfilled not many days hence; and then they are assured, that they shall receive power to become witnesses of Him to the uttermost part of the earth. When Christ had spoken these things, He was taken up into the heavens, to return again, first in the power of the promised Spirit, dispensing the various gifts of the ministry (Ephesians iv. 8), and then in the end, in like manner as they had seen Him ascend, in the clouds of glory.

There is nothing arbitrary in this intimate linking together of the Ascension of Christ, and the office and work of the ministry. They are bound of necessity together, just as they come before us in the Scripture lessons for Ascension Day. The ministry, with its hallowed commission, is not the result of a convention of Christians selecting officers to represent their wishes and will, but a mystery of grace, involving the powers of the world to come into which Christ ascended,—derived directly from Christ, and therefore descending from the heavens through the Spirit, as a true *Ascension gift*. Hence the Apostles were to *await* the mystery, watching in prayer for the promised baptism, which should empower them to go forth and be witnesses of Christ to the uttermost part of the earth. This, as we have said, is that which makes the following Sunday, to which we now turn, a *Dominica expectationis*, the threshold Sunday of the great Pentecost.

We have already referred to the introit of this Sunday, which at once so beautifully reveals the tone of the service; and we may expect that this tone also will characterize the selection of the Scripture lessons. In the gospel (St. John xv. 26-xvi. 1, the same as in the Liber Comitis, except that in this latter the selection continues to the closing clause of the fourth verse of the xvi. chap.), the sadness of the waiting disciples is to be lightened by the anticipation of the promised Comforter who will come. Christ, now ascended to the Father, will send

Him; and He coming will be an illuminating witness to them of all that they have seen and handled of the word of life; and they, through Him, shall become witnesses of Jesus to the world. In the hope of all this, they stand between Ascension and Pentecost, sad that the Lord hath gone and they themselves are alone, but waiting and watching for His return. They had asked Him, as they surrounded Him on the way to Olivet, whether He would now restore again the kingdom to Israel; and no doubt they connected with the Promise which He gave them, many elements of that vision of Messianic glory, which hovered before the imagination of the Jews.

The Epistle (1 Pet. iv. 7-11, the same as in the Liber Comitis) turns from the objective mystery of the coming Promise, to the inward subjective attitude of prudence, and watchfulness, and prayer, necessary in awaiting it. And here, inasmuch as the ministry has come into view, reaching over to Christ's return in glory, the selection is made to be of such character as to include a reference to this. "The end of all things is at hand." The whole ministry of the Church looks out to such end. As the Apostles stood between Ascension and Pentecost, waiting Christ's return, and bound together in a new brotherhood of love,—a band of sheep amongst wolves:—so does the whole ministry stand now between Pentecost and the Second Advent, waiting the glorification which shall be revealed when Christ shall appear in glory. In the meanwhile they are stewards to minister the gifts which they *have received*. They are to speak, not merely as organs of this or that body of men, but as the oracles of God, empowered so to do by the Holy Ghost. Their ability in such mission cometh from God; and their ministry has for its end His glorification through Christ, to whom the everlasting praise and dominion is to be given. Thus the *cænaculum*, where the Apostles and disciples remained, waiting in prayer and with one accord, widens in our meditation, by the descent of the Holy Ghost, into the mystery of the Holy Catholic Church. The same watchful waiting, the same accordant hopes and prayers, the same fervent charity one to another, binding all together and holding them in separation

from the world, is to characterize the Church also, as she waits the glad voice, "*the Bridegroom cometh.*"

There are some variations in the lessons assigned for this Sunday after Ascension in the early Lectionaria, but no selections, we believe, which, by giving a wrong tone, set the day out of its proper relation to the preceding Ascension and the following Pentecost. In the Lect. Gallicanum, *e. g.*, the Gospel is selected from the seventeenth chapter of John, where the Ascension to the Father, as a high-priestly entrance into the Holy of Holies, has opened the way for Christ's intercession in the presence of the Father. This intercession is for the Church. Christ had sent the disciples, by direct commission, into the world; and now He prays for them as their advocate, and sanctifies Himself, that they may be sanctified through the truth, and not only they, but all who shall believe on Him through their word.

The Epistle in the same lectionarium is selected from the eighteenth and nineteenth chapters of Acts, where Paul discovers on his journey to Ephesus certain disciples, who had not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost. They seem to have been recipients only of the baptism of John the Baptist; and neither knew, nor had received, the Promise. Paul baptized them, and laid his hands upon them, and they received the Holy Ghost, and spake with tongues and prophesied. It is quite plain, that these selections are characteristic of the day, as standing between Ascension and Pentecost, and refer to subjects which, in such transition from the one mystery to the other, should most properly engage the meditation of the Church.

We come now to the Feast of Pentecost, the *ἡμέρα Πνεύματος*. The Ascension closes the festivals which have to do with the earthly, bodily presence of Christ, so far at least as the cultus of the *militant* Church can go. She *awaits* another Christ festival, which shall perpetuate them all in one eternal feast, when He shall come in glory to judge the quick and dead. Therefore she ends her year, which revolves around Christ from Advent to Advent, in reaching out toward this con-

summation with sighs, and prayers, and longing vigils. She cannot celebrate it now, although it is an integral part of her Creed. The Ascension, therefore, in the cycle of the Church Year is just what St. Bernard has so beautifully called it, "*felix clausula totius itinerarii Filii Dei.*"

All the pericopes, from the Resurrection onward, have steadily directed the attention of the Church toward the mystery of Pentecost. Not only did the Saviour, during the forty days following His resurrection, speak to the disciples of things pertaining to the kingdom which was to be fully established through the Spirit, and turn them with expectant prayers toward the great mystery; but in His own person also the process of glorification, which, commencing with the resurrection, blossomed into the glory of being lifted up into the heavens, reached out of necessity to such a fact of reproducing fructification as confronts us in the outpouring of the Holy Ghost, and the mission of the Church. As, in way of illustration, the vital plasticity is confined within the plant while its process of development goes onward into the completion of blossom; and as, when this is reached, the old form of its manifestations gives way, and the vital plasticity comes into a new mode of activity, releasing itself from the old form which passes away, and multiplying its presence into a thousand seeds,—a harvest of reproduction; so the eternal Spirit is, as it were, confined within the bodily presence of Jesus while His process of sanctification moves forward ("I sanctify myself"); but when the glorification of His Ascension is reached, the old form is transcended, and the Spirit is released from that confinement, and shed forth in the power and mystery of reproduction,—a harvest pentecost of grace, in which also the whole past process becomes illumined and understood as never before. It is still a presence of Christ,—His mystical body. But it is quite a new mode of His habitation in the world. He is still the source and substance of the salvation, which is made ours through the Spirit. Through the Spirit indeed, and by no bond of nature, by no tie of flesh, but by a conception and birth of the Holy Ghost, we are in Him, and He is in us. "In that day" (when the Com-

forter cometh who dwelleth with you and shall be in you), "ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you."

This profound significance of Pentecost as related to the Person, and to the whole life and mission of Jesus, is that which the gospel selection (St. John xiv. 15-31, the same as in the Liber Comitis) except that the selection begins with the 23d verse), is designed to bring into view. This form of Christ's presence, as in the flesh, was not to be abiding. The fact, so long as the disciples were wedded to the old order of manifestation, could but be a cause of sadness and discomfort. But His Ascension and consequent intercession,—His full transcendence thus of the old order of presence with them, He now assures them is only to open the way for something more real and permanent and inward. "I will pray the Father, and He shall give you another Comforter, that He may abide with you forever"—a *Paraclete*,—one called to stand beside you as solace and aid,—yea, more, "He dwelleth with you and shall be in you." The gift of the Comforter, however, is not a mere recompense for the absence of Jesus; for the statement follows, "I will not leave you comfortless, I will come unto you." Thus a new and higher presence of Jesus is realized in the gift of the Spirit, because by the indwelling of the Spirit, the bond of a more intimate union of the disciples with Christ is reached. "Because I live, ye shall live also." The Spirit shall bring unto them the real substance of that life which is eternal in the bosom of the Father. Then, *at that day*, "ye shall know that I am in the Father, and ye in me, and I in you,"—a revelation of the bond holding together the Father and the Son, and of the power binding them also within that everlasting unity of love. The old hymn of Hildebert gives fine expression to this precious truth.\*

"Spiritus Sancte, Pie Paraclite

"Amor Patris et Filii, nexus Gignentis et Geniti

\* \* \* \* \*

Vinculum nectens Deum homini, virtus adunans hominem Numini."

---

\* Vid. Daniel Thesaurus Hymnol. Tom. v. 204.



Through the Spirit there is such an implanting, such an adunation of all believers in the mystery of the Trinity, that they are the household of God, indeed, as St. Paul says (Ephes. ii. 18-22), the habitation of God in the Spirit, κατοικητηριον του θεου εν Πνευματι. Still further, the Spirit comes to glorify Christ in them, to bring His whole mission to such an inward recognition upon their part, as that they shall see enshrined therein a glory such as had heretofore not dawned upon their faith. The miracles and parables, the conflicts and struggles, the whole vast compass of the Saviour's life which had passed before their eyes, shall through the Spirit rise up now before them in new significance and power, shall be brought to their remembrance in a form in which the earthly is transfigured,—in which the deep, hidden glory which had uttered itself in veiled forms of manifestation, shall find an ever unfolding apocalypse of itself,—in which the few years, during which He had been with them, shall widen into a grand poem of life, a glorious Messiad, reaching out into the eternal. The Spirit comes a paraclete, an author and a giver of life, a teacher of all truth, glorifying Christ in them, and glorifying them in Christ.

This rich gospel-lesson, which space does not allow us to discuss further, gives us the proper stand-point from which to interpret the Epistle, as this takes up the historical fact of the Spirit's coming, wherein He shows Himself to the disciples as the great Paraclete, filling them with ecstatic love, entering their spirits, and illuminating them with His own celestial light, and empowering and emboldening them to unfold the mystery of grace, which now comes flooding in upon their consciousness with a new fulness of significance and glory, and to gather in the first fruits of the great harvest. As we have remarked, the *cœnaculum*, now through the presence of the Spirit, widens into the mystery of the Holy Catholic Church, founded upon the Apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone.

It is not out of place here to examine this Epistle-selection (Acts ii. 1-11) somewhat in detail, since it records a fact so fundamental and preformative in reference to the whole develop-

ment of grace in the world, and opens the way as a lesson, for the transition to the second division of the Church Year, which now, if following the Creed, as it most certainly does, will take up the mystery of the Church and the Communion of Saints, as this through forgiveness of sins and the resurrection passes on into the glory of life everlasting.

"*And when the day of Pentecost was fully come,*" the lesson begins, as though the Spirit had tarried until the appropriate and appointed season had arrived for His manifestation. Just as the betrayal and death of Christ, involving the substance of that which the Old Testament passover foreshadowed, synchronized with that Old Testament passover, taking it up and carrying it into the reality of fulfillment; just so does the coming of the Spirit synchronize with the Old Testament pentecost festival; and that which was in this but shadow, gives place now to the reality which meets it, and fulfills it. It is quite vain to suppose that this is but a chance coincidence which might as well have been otherwise. The old festivals were not empty forms and ceremonies, but designed, while turning the spirit to what was yet to come, to awaken the capacity for that future grace, and to form a bosom of active, prophetic sympathies longing for fulfillment. As the whole moral nature, under the guidance of specific divine revelation, turned toward the promised glory, its very turning formed the proper condition for that glory in the end to find entrance and lodgment within. Who can doubt but that the disciples, who were now, from their past intercourse with Christ, apprehending more clearly the deep prophetic mysteries of the old economy,—who can doubt, but that they turned their thoughts towards the approaching Pentecost with aspirations and longings stirring more powerfully than ever before within their spirits, and whose depths they could not fathom? Who can doubt but that prophetic sympathies were swelling within their souls as they revolved the promise which the Saviour had given them, and which He said should be fulfilled not many days hence? "They were all with one accord in one place," looking forward and hastening unto the coming of the Promise. In that united and expectant

band, all Judaism under the power of that discipline which had covered long ages, was turning its heart toward Pentecost as never before, and inwardly ripening to be gathered in as the first fruits of a harvest, which should be the glorious antitype of that which the old festival typified.

Now as a proper response once for all to this, and to all the pentecost aspirations of centuries, "suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance." New mysteries now crowd into view from the heavenly world. New symbols of what is to be accomplished challenge the inquiring faith of those who are enfolded with the festal glory. The whole atmosphere of the new life, of which the glorified Jesus is the source and substance, is in motion by the Spirit to fill the longing void of the waiting disciples, and thrill them with the sound of its mysterious coming. Their *exaudi* has been heard. An enkindling fire, which melts and purifies and moulds far beyond what the Promethean myth dimly adumbrated, now warms them into fervid utterance. As, when some potent earthly influence sweeps over the chords of our emotional nature, an utterance thrills forth which is not language in its ordinary form;—a groan of pain, a sigh of love, a burst of joy, a wail of agony, universally intelligible: so now, only in an infinitely higher sense and sphere, the hand of the eternal Spirit sweeps over the chords of their souls, and ecstatic tones leap forth from the trembling agitated strings—new tongues of spiritual utterance,—intelligible to all who come within the sphere of the Spirit's power. The barriers of disintegrating sin are thrown down; the curse of Babel's proud defiance is removed; and for one rapturous moment is realized that ineffable unity which transcends all earthly communions, where there is neither Greek nor Jew, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free; but Christ is all and in all. We have in all this the reality of a spiritual harvest, towards which the old Pentecost in way of

symbol pointed. The first fruits of the whole antecedent culture of Judaism, which through the presence of Christ and the descent of the Holy Ghost has come to a ripened maturity, are now gathered in and given to God with a new festal joy and rapture far beyond anything which meets us in the old economy.

The mystery with which Whitsunday has to do is too broad and significant to be left to the service of one day only. Like the other great festivals, it is surrounded in the old service, with a cluster of pericopes all of which, in their selection, have been controlled by it. Connected with the vigils of Pentecost there was a full public service, the gospel selection for which in the Liber Comitis, is from John xiv. 15-21, the same as has been embraced in the lesson for Pentecost in our "Order of Worship." The Epistle selection is from Acts xix. 1-8, which meets us again, as before remarked, in the Lect. Gal., for the Sunday after Ascension. For the day after Pentecost, feria secunda, or Whitmonday, the pericopes in the Liber Comitis, are those which meet us in our "Order of Worship," viz., John iii. 16-21, and Acts x. 34-48. The design of the Gospel selection here is to bring Pentecost into view as that revelation of God's love, in which the gift of Jesus comes to have *universal application* in the way of grace, reaching the whole world, so that whosoever believeth, Jew or Gentile, may be saved and not perish. The kingdom, now established by the Spirit, expands beyond the old covenant, embracing all alike who will come to the light in the obedience of faith. The Epistle is in full harmony with the Gospel, carrying the Pentecost at Jerusalem in to a kindred pentecost which gathers in the Gentile world, as part of the first fruits of the same glorious harvest. Peter, illumined by the Spirit, opens his mouth and says, Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation, he that feareth Him and worketh righteousness is accepted with Him. And then speaking of Christ, who is Lord of all, he says, "And He commanded us to preach unto the people, and to testify that it is He which was ordained of God to be the judge of quick and dead. To Him give all the

prophets witness, that through His name whosoever believeth in Him shall receive remission of sins." This is but a paraphrase of the Gospel selection, and forms the base for the Gentile Pentecost which follows and which astonished the Jews who were present.

In the octave of Pentecost, or Trinity Sunday, to which we now turn, we pass fully into the second great division of the Church Year, and in this follow the order of the Creed. The *ηθος* of the early Church made any other order impossible. The outward, objective facts of the divine revelation, as they have been made to pass before us from the Nativity onward to the Resurrection, the Ascension, and Pentecost, are now, through the ever abiding presence of the Spirit, to come to an inward revelation, where that supernatural constitution of grace made possible by such revelation and now present in the world through the Spirit, apprehends and incorporates into itself, our human life. The powers of the world to come, thus apprehending and being apprehended, open the way for an Epiphany of the Spirit, in which, through the Church, our life is to be carried onward in an order of grace to its full emergence from the old world-life into the completed new creation,—the new heavens and new earth of the Church triumphant. In this transition we pass not to that which is subjective in the sense merely of Christian experiences and thoughts, held quite apart from the objective mysteries of revelation going before. On the contrary, the octave of Pentecost marks that sublime synthesis, where by the Spirit, through a birth which is from above, our whole life is incorporated with that order of Grace, that kingdom of God, in which the new creation in Christ Jesus is made to comprehend and to carry on to its proper consummation the old creation, embracing so far as our specific human life is concerned the whole compass of body, soul, and spirit, and with this the whole sphere of the finite in which this life in all its various forms manifests itself.

It is a serious mistake to suppose that the Church has set apart the octave of Pentecost in the interest of a mere mental synthesis, as though now, having passed through a thorough

analysis of the revelation of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, the time had come for gathering all this by a rational process, into the unity of a single dogmatic formula, viz., God is three in person, and one in nature. The octave of Pentecost is set apart in the interest of an altogether different synthesis, viz., the mystery that by the Spirit's descent the way is opened for us to be born into that wondrous revelation of God, to be lifted up into that kingdom of grace which the revelation has brought into the world, that in this way it may penetrate and interfuse our whole being with its redemptive activity, glorifying it in a communion far beyond what meets us in nature, and through a precious, supernatural process, viz., remission of sins, resurrection of the body, and everlasting life—a process resting throughout, from beginning to end, in the fact, that the glorified life of Christ is made over through the Spirit.

The Trinity comes into view just because we are by the Spirit baptized into the mystery. "In that day ye shall know that I am in the Father, and ye in me, and I in you." The day has to do with a fact of grace which Pentecost has realized, and with no abstraction or outward confession merely. As at the baptism of Jesus in Jordan, the heavens were opened, and the Spirit descended upon Christ, and the voice of the Father was heard saying, This is my beloved Son, giving a full revelation of the Trinity therein; so in the regeneration wrought in baptism by the Spirit, the early Church ever regarded that there was a real opening of the heavens, and a real implanting of our life into the mystery of the Trinity. Hence the octave of Pentecost most naturally took up this mystery, as coming to a revelation in this real way, and assumed the name of Trinity Sunday, without losing its character as immediately related to the presence and work of the Holy Ghost.

In the *Liber Comitis* the day is called "*Dominica Octava Pentecosten*," and the gospel selection (John iii. 1-15, the same in our "*Order of Worship*") takes up the interview of Nicodemus with the Saviour. Nicodemus seems willing through the attestation of miracles, to acknowledge Christ as a teacher

sent from God. He fails, however, to grasp the mystery, that Jesus in His own person was the fulness of grace and truth, the source and substance of salvation for mankind; and, failing to grasp this, he fails to have any proper sense of the Messianic kingdom to be established in its contrast with the old economy which he represented. He is met, therefore, at once with the fundamental statement, that without a birth from above it is impossible to see the kingdom of God. This is a birth of the Spirit, quite distinct from the circumcision and carnal washings of Judaism, though symbolized thereby. Here, as before remarked, Pentecost is viewed as authenticating itself by giving the power of a new and heavenly birth into the kingdom which the Spirit established. This birth from above, as we have said, the early Church regarded as accomplished in baptism. Here there was a real insertion into the mystery of the *Trinity*, which was by divine commission the baptismal creed. St. Hilary, in the prayer which concludes his work on the Trinity, well expresses the universal sense of the Church in this regard, calling the Trinity the creed of his regeneration in baptism, and praying that he may hold unto death what he had in this way professed. ("Conserva, oro, hanc fidei meæ incontaminatam religionem, et usque ad excessus spiritus mei dona mihi hanc conscientiæ meæ vocem: ut quod in regenerationis meæ Symbolo, baptizatus in Patre, et Filio, et Spiritu Sancto, professus sum, semper obtineam." *Patr. Cur. Com. Tom. x. pp. 471-472.*)

In the Epistle (Rev. iv. 1-11), the door of Heaven is opened and St. John in the Spirit both sees and enters into the kingdom, where is unfolded before him the whole sublime conflict and final victory of the Church. The selection closes where the Elders fall down before Him that sat upon the throne, and worship Him that liveth forever and ever. Such beatific vision in the end, and such ascension into the sphere of the heavenly, is involved in the fellowship of the Spirit through whom we are made to sit in heavenly places in Christ Jesus. Such heavenly things, intimated in the gospel selection, are the necessary consequence of that supernatural birth beginning on



the earth and closing in glory. Just as the Resurrection and Ascension consummate the Epiphany of that mystery, which came in the holy nativity of Christ; just so does our resurrection and ascension and our eternal worship, casting our crowns before him with ascriptions of glory and honor and power, close the Epiphany of that mystery which began in that holy nativity, when we were born of the Holy Ghost.

In turning now to the post Trinity Sundays, it is important, before entering into detail, to fix clearly in our mind what is involved in the transition which has been made. Through the descent of the Spirit we have the birth-day of the Church, and also the mystery of our incorporation therein through a real spiritual birth. This presence of divine grace, thus apprehending us and operative within us, reveals to our consciousness as never before, the necessary distinction between the new creation in Christ Jesus, as this confronts us in the Holy Catholic Church, and the order of nature, or the old creation as under the law of sin and death. This distinction is of such character as to involve a continuous antagonism, so that the presence of Christ in us throughout the whole development of the Church meets with opposition, conflict and persecution corresponding with the same movement of humiliation and suffering, as was found in the objective Epiphany of Christ from the nativity onward to the Cross. It is just this great truth, which the pericopes and collects bring designedly before our view from Trinity onward to the consummation of the antagonism in the great catastrophe of the last day, and the resurgent victory of the Cross. The first Advent mystery moved onward to Christ's coming in the Spirit at Pentecost. Now the coming of Christ in us, our holy nativity through the Spirit, moves onward in the bosom of the Church to another Advent of Christ, when the full glory of the Spirit is reached in the spiritual body and life everlasting, but through a kindred conflict, and suffering, and sacrifice. We bear about with us the dying of the Lord Jesus, and with power in the Spirit to transcend death in the resurrection, so that when He appears who is our life, we shall appear with Him in glory.

Now we are bound to the old creation in the sphere of *life*. It is not in the way of will merely, nor yet in the way of thought, that we are linked to the natural world, but in the organism of life. The deep inward movement of our whole being finds itself at once in communion with the whole natural order in which we are. We open our eyes to nature in nature, and our hearts to the bosom of family and national life within the same. We are apprehended by these forces of the natural order at once in our birth; and our apprehension of them is primarily not by any process of self-determination or intellection, but by a sympathy or innate instinct which rises up within us spontaneously, and shows itself at once broader and deeper than any personal effort. Our birth in nature involves the sympathetic turning of our whole being to the world. We feel instinctively, at the outset, that we are of the world. We see it with our eyes, we hear it with our ears, and our hearts are toned inwardly to sympathy with its whole order. The father loves not his child after a process of reasoning upon the duty or of self-determination; but the bond between him and his child is itself a bond of love. The paternal instincts here, where not blighted by sin, are stronger than those which meet us in lower nature. The child comes to a sense of the family, because bound up in it by his very birth. The communion here is broader and vastly more comprehensive than all self-determinations can be. Just so, only in a still higher form, are we born through the Spirit into the supernatural world, into a higher communion than that of the family or the nation, the communion of Saints, the fellowship of the Spirit, the household of God. The first necessary response upon our part is a new instinctive sympathy of our whole regenerate being with all this, not an apprehension of it in way of intellect, nor in the way of activity of will simply, but a communion with it that comes to assert itself in the form of that oneness of sympathy, that interior wedlock, that twain becoming one, that felt correlation of the two in the organism of life broader and deeper than any self-determined relation can be. This is love, the sense of a life communion here revealing itself as at the base of all Christian activity. Without it, whatever may be our faith

or works, whatever our utterances or knowledge, we are as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal. Hence the first Sunday after Trinity, as opening up the process of Christian life which has commenced with a new spiritual birth into the family and household of God; centres just here. In both Gospel and Epistle this is the theme, and in just such a broad deep sense. Love is at once the very principle and law of the divine kingdom, the first instinctive life characteristic of the unfolding of the life of grace.

In the Gospel selection (St. Luke xvi. 19-31), the rich man fails to grasp the mystery of love in Jehovah's covenant with Abraham. He cannot see how far this passed beyond all worldly relations in which he stood. Instead of his life, according to the law and the Prophets, going out in love to God and his neighbor, and finding itself glorified in the realities of that communion vouchsafed him, it turns back upon self to find its satisfaction and rest in the world-order alone. This at once benumbs the whole heart, so that it cannot feel that one shut out from the blessings of this world's life can be within the bosom of that higher communion of God. There is no hope, therefore, that anything within will prompt to any activity of love such as a sense of this communion would of necessity awaken. But Lazarus, though forsaken of the world, though dying unhelped at the rich man's gate, is still within the hidden depths of his being in that precious fellowship which Dives failed to realize—the fellowship of Angels who bear him into Abraham's bosom, a child of the covenant family gathered to his home.

What the Gospel selection gives us in the form of bold contrast reaching into the world to come, is now presented in its most positive and fundamental character in the Epistle (1 John iv. 7-21). Love, whose source is God, and which becomes ours by our birth of God in the fellowship of the Spirit ("Hereby know we that we dwell in Him and He in us, because He hath given us of His Spirit"), and which embraces the whole communion of the beloved, and which reaches out to a perfectness, giving boldness in the day of judgment (how unlike Dives, and how realized in Lazarus!)—love is the theme; and the selection

has been made without doubt as resting back upon what precedes, viz., our spiritual birth into the kingdom of grace, which is now in this way revealing a sense of its wondrous fellowship in love.

We have said that the new creation finds itself of necessity in antagonism with the old. What is born of the flesh is flesh, and what is born of the Spirit is Spirit. The birth according to the flesh is under the curse, and moves onward universally into death. The birth of the Spirit passes out from condemnation into life. The two are, therefore, in necessary opposition, and never, until the old creation is transformed by glorification into the new heavens and new earth both outwardly as regards the order of life and history around us, and inwardly in the sphere of our own personal being, can this opposition be fully transcended and absolute rest be found. Just here, therefore, comes the power of temptation, the communion of this world contending against the communion of Saints. As the latter comes to assert itself, so at once the former resists it as feeling itself challenged. No sooner have we the Epiphany of Christ as the assertion of positive grace, whether in His own person or in us through the Spirit, than we have the epiphany of evil in the assertion of the world, the flesh, and the Devil, in opposition.

This opposition was intimated in the parable of Dives and Lazarus; but now it comes out more distinctly in the pericopes for the second Sunday after Trinity. The great festival supper in the family and household of God, the gift and evidence of love, to which our birth in the covenant gives us access and calls us, and the dissenting response of those entitled to it, dissenting just because immersed in the world-order and all its counterrelations and interests, constitutes the Gospel (St. Luke xiv. 16-24). And here the opposition only deepens, or draws out the fervor of that love which seeks outcasts in lanes and highways, that the Lord's house may be filled. The hatred of the world, and the community of love among those who have passed from death unto life, forms the element of thought in the Epistle (1 John iii. 13-24). The emnity which reigns in the

world is met by the love which reigns in the communion of Saints, a love which came to its sublimest revelation in that Christ laid down His life for us; and a love possible in us also, in that we have passed from death unto life, and the love of God now dwelleth in us.

While the Epistle selection in the *Liber Comitis* is the same as the above, the Gospel lesson is taken from Matthew v. 20-24, \* where brotherly love is taught as a necessary element in that righteousness of the kingdom which must exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees. In this new communion, all retaliation must give way, all anger disappear, and full reconciliation condition all approach to the altar, a theme which comes up again in a subsequent lesson in our "Order of Worship."

In the third Sunday after Trinity, this love continues to be the theme; but now it reaches out into a self-sacrificing condescension and lowliness, seeking to maintain the integrity of the communion, by going after the straying and lost. The Saviour's holding intercourse with publicans and sinners causes the scribes and Pharisees to murmur, because their sense of superiority and self-exaltation could stoop to no such humiliation and degradation. How little they grasp that love which humbled itself even to the death of the Cross to save that which was lost! In the Gospel (St. Luke xv. 1-10) we have those precious parables, where Christ so calmly rebukes the self-exalted and murmuring Pharisees by revealing a condescension of love in such pointed contrast with their life, and which they may indeed proudly despise, but over which the Angels rejoice.

The Epistle (1 Peter v. 5-11) has the same theme, where the necessity of such humility of love in preserving the integrity of the communion is heightened by the declaration, that the adversary, as a roaring lion, walketh about seeking whom he

---

\* Daniel in his *Pericoparum Conspectus*, gives the same Gospel selection to the *Liber Comitis* as meets us in our "Order of Worship." In the copy occurring in St Jerome's works published by Megne, I find the selection as above given.

may devour. The straying sheep of the fold must, therefore, be guarded with vigilance, and not neglected through any self-exaltation or feeling of superiority. The love of the fold, of the household, of the family of God must be so great as to insure all sacrifice and all afflictions, knowing that God resisteth the proud and giveth grace to the humble. Over against the adversary they have the great Shepherd, who hath called them unto eternal glory, and who will make their sufferings, a humiliation involving within itself the reality of exaltation. Sacrifice flowing from love, is in fact love's victory, wherein it shows its depth and breadth of power.

While in the gospel for the third Sunday after Trinity, the self-exaltation and spiritual pride of the Pharisees is met by that strength of love, which, in the Communion of Saints, shows itself in stooping to rescue those who are straying from it and becoming lost; in the next gospel lesson (St. Luke vi. 36-42) love goes even further in that humility which glorifies. The Pharisees failed in love, because they had not the Spirit of Christ abiding in them. He came to save the lost sheep of Israel. Yea more! He loved us while we were yet enemies and laid down His life for us. "Peradventure for a good man, some would even dare to die. But God commendeth His love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." It is this sublime height of love which the gospel lesson for the fourth Sunday after Trinity emphasizes.

His love goes out not merely to the straying sheep, but to enemies and persecutors; breaking down the natural impulses of judgment and condemnation; awakening long suffering, mildness, and mercy; and opening the stream of forgiveness, whose ever-living fountain is the mystery of our forgiveness by God. The Master condemned not, but forgave; and this perfection of love we must have as children of the Highest, and members of His holy family, however much the world may hate and persecute. The selection is taken from that beautiful paragraph in St. Luke's account of Christ's sermon to His disciples, which begins: "But I say unto you which hear, Love your enemies,

do good to them which hate you. Bless them that curse you, and pray for them which despitefully use you." The verse immediately preceding the selection of the lesson gives us at once the tone of the lesson. "Love your enemies, and do good, and lend, hoping for nothing again; and your reward shall be great, and ye shall be the children of the Highest: for He is kind unto the unthankful and to the evil." Love enkindles forgiveness and mercy; and there is no sacrifice which it cannot make. It endureth all things. No power of earth, however fiercely assailing, can quench its flame; for it is the gift of the Spirit, and kept alive by the very breath of God.

This sacrificing love, so full of mercy and forgiveness, brings into view the necessary antagonism between the kingdom of divine grace, and the order of the world; for it comes to its exercise indeed in the midst of buffetings and persecutions. Its mystery, however, cannot be grasped by the world, and on this account only challenges an additional response of the world's reproach and shame. It needs, therefore, the continual support of that hope of our calling, which inwardly strengthens it and deepens its power. As Christ, for the joy that was set before Him, endured the cross, despising the shame; so in us through the Spirit He repeats the same mystery, and we, reaching beyond the sufferings of this present time, look to that glory which shall be revealed in us, and join in the groaning of the whole creation, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of the body. Without this all is vain and perishing, and we above all most miserable. With this, however, we can transcend the vanity of this present world, in love awaiting the reward of love. This reaching out beyond the present time of trial and waiting toward the glory which is to be revealed,—a love hoping all things and believing all things, is brought to view in the Epistle selection (Rom. viii. 18-23), and breathes through the Collect in our "Order of Worship" and in the old introit also, which, like that of the Sunday after Ascension, is, "Exaudi, Domine, vocem meam,"—the voice of suffering love waiting for the manifestation of the sons of God.

In the lessons thus far, commencing with Pentecost which



with its octave, is the pivot of transition,—the “Angelpunct der Himmelsachse,” we have had the descent of the Spirit, establishing the Church upon the foundation of the Apostles and prophets; incorporating us therein through the spiritual birth of baptism; and binding together the Communion of Saints in love, as one family in Christ, as the habitation of God in the Spirit (“God is love; and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him”). We have been directed also to the great supper prepared and now ready in the household of the Father;—that supper which is the “seal of Christ’s perpetual presence in the Church by the Holy Ghost; the pledge of His undying love for His people;—and the bond of His living union and fellowship with them to the end of time.” We have seen the invitation to this feast rejected by those immersed in the life of the world, which opposes itself to the mystery. We have seen further, that, in this communion of saints, love removes all spiritual pride and self-exaltation, and preserves itself in that submission one to another,—that condescension which seeks the straying and lost,—that the integrity of the communion may be maintained against the Adversary, who seeks to destroy it. Still more; we have been taught that this love, should be all-sacrificing, extended to enemies and persecutors, and showing itself in mercy and forgiveness, assured that amidst all sufferings it shall abide, looking forward to, and strengthened by that glory which is set before it.

Now, however, in the fifth Sunday after Trinity, we are to be directed to the truth, that the Church is not only to be passive in this patient endurance of love, but by means of this is to extend itself in the world, gathering into itself by *conquests of love*, assured that the word of God shall be glorified in the world, and that God will bless His heritage, and make His strength perfect in weakness. The introit at once rightly intones the service of the day. “*Dominus fortitudo plebis suæ: et protector salutarium Christi sui est. Salvum fac populum tuum, Domine, et benedice hæreditatem tuam: et rege eos usque in sæculum*” (“Conclusion of Psalm xxviii). The Collect

in our "Order of Worship" is in most beautiful accord with the theme to which the pericopes direct our meditation.

The incident which is related in the gospel-selection (St. Luke v. 1-11) is in itself a parable, which Peter, James, and John must have recognized as such when Jesus said to Simon, "From henceforth thou shalt catch men." They forsook all, and followed Him, called to another mission which their present fishing in Gennesaret and the miraculous draught of fishes symbolized. By themselves they had toiled all night in vain. They had given up, and had drawn their two boats up on to the beach, and were washing their nets. The Saviour enters into Simon's ship, and from it, pushed out a little from land, He taught the people; and then, having dismissed the multitude, he said to Simon "*Launch out into the deep, and let down your nets for a draught.*" At His word, though against his own judgment, he let down the nets, and lo, he had to call his partners to give help; and together they filled the two ships so that they began to sink.

Who can fail to see the general outlines of the mystery hidden beneath these facts? How could the Communion of Saints (with which the lessons now have to do in full accord with the order of the Creed), extending itself by gathering souls into the Church from the restless waves of this world's life, and wholly dependent for success in this work upon the presence and power of Christ, and finding success just when, according to the judgment of nature, nothing promises it, how could the Communion of Saints under this view be more beautifully pictured forth?

The Epistle (1 Peter iii. 8-15) while yet dwelling upon the accordant love of the children of God, emphasizes the necessity of their confidence in the Lord's presence and blessing, whatsoever may be the difficulties surrounding them, and leading them to despond. It is by their trust, their sweetness of disposition and demeanor, their mutual compassion and brotherly love, their restraint of judgment, and their being followers of that which is good, that they disarm opposition, allure the enemy, and make their conquests; or, if not accomplishing

this latter, they ensure upon their own part inward serenity, and peace, and meekness, through which the Lord is glorified, and the communion inwardly strengthened for greater conquests yet to come.

“Πελαγὸς κακίας

Ἰχθὺς ἀγνοίας

Κοιματος ἐχθροῦ

Τλυκερῇ Ζωῇ\* δελεάζων”. Clement of Alexandria.

Space does not allow us, in this article, to examine further the post-trinity pericopes. We wish to append a few remarks upon the Trinity festival.

As we have said, the first Sunday after Pentecost was originally regarded as the octave of Pentecost, and not as a specific Trinity festival. In the Old Lectionaria it is called ‘octavas Pentecostis’ and ‘Octaba Pentecosten.’ The Sundays subsequent are called Sundays after Pentecost, and not as now Sundays after Trinity. In the Liber Comitis this designation of the Sundays continues to the sixth Sunday after Pentecost, and then there comes a new designation. “Dominica post natale apostolorum.”† The festival of the Apostles Peter and Paul occurred on the 29th of June. This new designation of the Sundays continues until the festival of St. Laurentius occurs, which makes another change in the designation.

The octave of Pentecost, from the very nature of its service, referring to the spiritual birth accomplished by the Holy Ghost in baptism, which was in the name of the Trinity, drew to itself the Trinity festival when this came to be fully established in the Church. This establishment by the Church of a distinct Trinity festival must have been the result of a gradually spreading custom of giving, at the octave of Pentecost, a particular emphasis to the baptismal Creed. We have the evidence of

\* Dative of means, we think, rather than the dative of the end, on which the action comes to rest—inciting “by sweet life” rather than “unto or for sweet life.”

† “In Kal. Rom. Allatiano post Dominicam quintam post Pentecosten, Dominicem, secus quam hodie, recensentur : quæ enim festum S. Petri Apostoli subsequitur. 3 Kt. Tul. ‘Dominica prima post Natale Apostolorum’ dicitur (Du Cange).”

this from history. Micrologus,\* in his collection of liturgical documents, mentions the occurrence of this feast as an unwarranted innovation, showing that already in his day the custom was spreading. † He asserts that Alcuin composed the introit of the mass. This Augusti denies, acknowledging, however, that Alcuin worked on the liturgy, correcting and composing; and that subsequently one of his introits was selected as best adapted for this service. Gavanti refers to Rupert, as mentioning this feast with favor and assigning a reason for it, which, in our judgment, is the one most accordant with the truth of history, viz., that immediately after the advent of the Spirit the mystery of the holy Trinity, in whose name baptism was given, began to be preached and to be believed. ‡ In the time of this Rupert, therefore, † 1124, according to Prithemius, *De Scriptor, Eccles.*, p. 273) the custom seems to have met with quite general favor. Durandus mentions the fact of its institution, adding what he calls the suitable cause (*quia Natalis Domini fuit Festum Patris, cui natus est Filius; Pascha fuit Festum Filii, Pentecostes Spiritus Sancti. Celebratur ergo statim trium simul personarum Festum, Sanctissimæ Trinitatis*). Yet, as Augusti says, § Durandus acknowledges the existence of varying customs in reference to it, and only favors, in preference to all others, the custom of Rome. In the thirteenth century, therefore, the time of Durandus, the Trinity festival was not fully established as controlling the service for the octave of Pentecost, but a custom sanctioned by Rome, which in the end gave it authority throughout Latin Christendom.

\* This Micrologus wrote in the latter part of the tenth century according to Cardinal Bona ("Auctor libri de Ecclesiasticis observationibus sub nomine Micrologi, que vivebat prope annum 1090." *Rerum Liturg.*, Lib. ii. cap. xx. p. 373, Antwerpian Ed. 1723).

† "In Octava Pentecostes fieri Festum Trinitatis, docet Microlog., cap. 6, ab aliquibus, quos reprehendit, quia propria auctoritate celebrabant" (Gavanti *Thesaur. Sac. Rit.* Pars iv. Tit. vii.)

‡ "Laudat idem Festum, eo quod post adventum Spiritus Sancti cepit statim prædicari et credi mysterium sanctissima Trinitatis, in cujus nomine dabatur Baptismus."

§ See Augusti *Denkward.*, christl., Archæ., vol. 2, pp. 424-433.

## ART. IV.—FREDERICK SCHLEIERMACHER.

BY ALEX. HARRIS, LANCASTER, PA.

I PROPOSE to present a brief sketch of the life, character, and opinions of a man, whose thoughts produced a more marked change in the sphere of theological life, and whose impress has been more fully imprinted upon his age than those, perhaps, of any other theologian who has advocated the cause of Protestantism since the days of Martin Luther. The man, of whom so much may with all truth be affirmed, was named Frederick Daniel Ernest Schleiermacher, born in Breslau, Silesia, November 21st, 1768. In his appearance as a theologian upon the arena of religious strife, the old Deistic system of Reimarus, Bahrdt, and Basedow met with its most successful opponent, and from this period is noted a new era in religious thinking in Germany and its universities. To understand properly the significance of his character and work, it is necessary by way of prelude to introduce a notice of the rise of rationalism upon German soil.

English Deism was transplanted to Germany in the publication of the celebrated "Wolfenbüttel Fragments" by Lessing. This student of Leibnitz, and also of Spinoza, published these, as he averred, not out of a desire to assail Christianity, but that reason might be enabled to assume its just position in biblical as it already had done in classical criticism. In the controversy that arose, Lessing, although positively asserting that his object in the publication was only to promote science, inquiry, and truth, nevertheless gradually permitted it to appear, that he disbelieved the possibility of a revelation, and that he held the light of nature to be all-sufficient for mankind. Lessing, Mendelssohn, and their followers, the great advocates of the sufficiency of reason for the discovery of truth, avowed their belief in the doctrines of one God, of Divine Providence, and the immortality of the soul.

Wolff had, from a churchly stand-point, prior to this evolution of undisguised Deism in Germany, introduced into theology his distinction between natural and revealed religion, besides a number of rational thoughts, from all which he is considered as entitled to the distinction of being the father of German rationalism. It was soon found that the critical school of Wolff, Ernesti, and Semler must in the end lead to the same conclusions as that arrived at by the open advocates of reason; and yet, they continued most emphatically to defend the harmony of their philosophic-religious system with that of the revealed word. The fears of the orthodox, as to the results to which the Wolffian school of theology must lead, were, however, not without foundation. This became clear when W. A. Teller, one of this school of critics, published his "new and purely Biblical system of Christian duties," and proclaimed a practical religion of reason as the essence of Christianity. Herein might be viewed, as it were, the union of two extremes. The followers of Lessing and those of Wolff virtually meet together in their researches, and proclaim that they have found the same truth: that Christianity is but a republication of the law of nature. This, then, was the complete triumph of reason. Here, now, the sentiments of Hobbes, Herbert of Cheshire, Bolingbroke, Tindal, Gibbon, and Hume were welcomed to the Fatherland, amidst the acclaims of German erudition; and the dogmas of Voltaire, Montesquieu, Condorcet, and the French Encyclopædists found a warm reception in the historical-critical school of Protestant exegesis.

This was now the period of German enlightenment (*Aufklärung*), the counterpart of the so-called mental illumination in France, which preceded and paved the way for those wild and extravagant excesses that subverted in that country all rights, both human and divine, during the bloody period of the revolution of 1789. Germany, indeed, did not reach the same depth of fanatical intoxication as France had done, owing largely to the difference between the two nationalities: the one being vapid, light and superficial; the other steady, logical and profound. While, therefore, in France the people had been

seduced by the philosophy of the Encyclopædists, in Germany it was the learned, chiefly, amongst whom the doctrines of rationalism had found its disciples; the masses remained very largely, however, uncontaminated in their faith, and the piety of Spener and Franke was yet to be found in many places in all its pristine purity. Even among the learned were some who had not yet bowed the knee to this Baal of rationalistic skepticism.

It was in the midst of this dominant skepticism which so generally prevailed amongst the learned classes in Germany, towards the close of the eighteenth century, that the parents of Schleiermacher turned their attention to the Moravian Institute at Niesky, in Upper Lusatia, as a place where genuine piety found a home, and one free from all the influence of the prevailing unbelief. Here, with a brother and sister, the youthful Schleiermacher was placed, and remained under the care of this excellent religious society for two years, at the end of which time, he was sent to the Moravian college at Barby.

It was among these devout people that he became inspired with that enthusiastic love of experimental religious feeling which afterwards characterized his whole career. The tones of Moravian piety are perceptible in all his writings. His own words concerning his early training are very touching. "Piety," says he, "was the maternal bosom in the sacred shade of which my youth was passed, and which prepared me for the yet unknown scenes of the world. In piety my spirit breathed before I found my peculiar station in science and the affairs of life; it aided me when I began to examine into the faith of my fathers, and to purify my thoughts and feelings from all alloy; it remained with me when the God and immortality of my childhood disappeared from my doubting sight; it guided me in active life; it enabled me to keep my character duly halloved between my faults and virtues: through its means I have experienced friendship and love."

From a boy he was disposed to doubt the truth of everything for which he could not find the most positive proof. Prior



even to entering the Moravian Institutes, he confesses himself to have been affected with a strange skepticism, which led him to doubt the genuineness of early authors. And now, although the youthful Schleiermacher had been placed by his parents under the care of the Moravians, from whose schools of learning all men of free-thinking and unorthodox opinions were excluded as instructors of youth, and although thus as it were hermetically sealed to the outside prevailing influences of the time, yet to the mind of our student of Barby skeptical notions still continued to present themselves. A mistrust sprung up within him, not only toward his Moravian instructors, but also against the whole system of the Christian religion, as one that seemed to him to be unable to endure the scrutiny of free inquiry. Like a tiny oak, planted in a flower-pot, which, when young, and tender, may grow well, but as it increases in size begins to decline, unless it be timely placed where its roots can have full space to extend themselves: in this condition we now find Schleiermacher. He had already outgrown the circle of thought at Barby; his inquisitive mind sought satisfaction in a more ample field, where he would be free to investigate *ad libitum* the foundations of both science and religion. This field of inquiry was alone to be found in the University; and he anxiously longed that he might be transferred to it. To obtain this, however, the consent of his father, (a German Reformed clergyman of uncontaminated orthodoxy), was necessary, and this was the great obstacle that lay in his way. He, for a time, hesitated as to whether he should dissemble or avow to his father his actual state of mind; his constitutional integrity, however, determined him to the latter course as most honorable. After long days and nights of anxiety, he finally plucks up courage, and in a trembling letter to his father confesses his unbelief. He acknowledges his inability to believe in the divinity of Christ, and in His vicarious death for mankind; and therefore, he conjures his father to allow him to enter the University, where an ample opportunity for research lay before him. Here, perhaps, he might be enabled to discover that his doubts were without foundation; and if not,

he might then be allowed to turn his attention to other pursuits than theology. But at all events, "*he must be permitted to investigate and know for himself*" what he shall regard as truth. We see in this confession the noble manhood and the vigorous and unconquerable will of Schleiermacher thus early manifesting themselves. No authority can compel him to refrain from investigation—evidence for him can alone produce conviction.

It is not difficult to conceive the feelings of the fond parent, when he received this letter from his son, confessing his own unbelief; especially as he had reposed in confidence that in the Moravian college, if in any place, he would be safe from the storms and billows of a skeptical age. He could see nothing, therefore, in this longing of his son to enter the University, save a triumph of stubborn pride, and his total estrangement from God. But with all his reluctance to acquiesce in the wishes of his son in this particular, stern orthodoxy yielded in the end to the softer dictates of paternal love. In reply his father thus addressed him: "O thou my foolish son, by what manner of fascination art thou overcome, that thou wilt no longer hearken to the dictates of truth? Alas! my son, my son, how deeply thou grieveest me, how hast thou caused me to sigh on thy account! But go thy way in the world, for the honors of which thou art so ambitious, and see if thy soul can with its husks be sated."

Through the influence of Prof. Stubenrauch, of Halle, a brother of his mother, the consent of his father was finally obtained, and Schleiermacher entered the University of Halle in 1787. He made his home in the house of his uncle, through whose interposition, in the end, a reconciliation of sentiment was effected between the father and son, the former coming to see in the latter qualities for which he had not given him credit. In this institution, his studies were not very methodically pursued, and they partook rather of the character of the fragmentary; yet to whatever branch he directed his attention he made therein great attainment. He attended the lectures of Semler, the great expounder of the neologic school; heard the

lectures of Wolf, the celebrated Greek scholar; made himself acquainted with modern languages and mathematics; and read the philosophical works of Spinoza, Kant, Fichte, and Jacobi. Even his father seems at this time to have been in full accord with him as to his course of investigation, since he himself advises him to peruse Lessing's work on the Education of the Human Race and Kant's Critic of Pure Reason. None of the different systems of thought treated by the above named great masters yielded him entire satisfaction, and yet he imbibed influences from each of them which became to him in after years a part of his own substratum. The age was then one of cold criticism and of speculative reasoning. No prior period in Europe had been in so high a degree skeptical; and German theology, in particular, was undergoing a revolution as radical as the political revolution of France. After passing through a two years' course at the University, he left it, without having a fixed system of religious opinions, yet with the hope of "attaining, by earnest research and patient examination of all the witnesses, to a reasonable degree of certainty, and to a knowledge of the boundaries of human science and learning."

In 1790, he passed the examination for licensure, and through the influence of his patron, the Rev. Mr. Sack, chaplain to the King of Prussia, he was received as private tutor in the family of Count Dohna, of Schlobitten, where he spent two years and a half of his life, and received his first polish in intercourse with refined society; for up to this time his knowledge of the world was very limited. Although his relation to the Count's family was rather unpleasantly terminated, yet Schleiermacher ever remembered the advantages that this position had afforded him, and the young Counts of Schlobitten still retained their reverence and esteem for their old instructor. In 1794, he took holy orders, and was placed by the church authorities as assistant to his uncle, a superannuated clergyman at Landsburg on the Wartha. Between his father and himself the most harmonious feeling now sprung up; the old parent rejoiced to perceive the pastoral activity and the zeal displayed by his son, in that calling in which he had ever longed to see him oc-

cupied. His pleasure was, however, like that of the ancient prophet, but a feeble glance. Death bore him from the vision of his son's activity, and the mind of the fond parent but slightly divined the great soul of Schleiermacher, whose mighty thoughts were destined to remould the theology of his age and generation.

In 1796, Schleiermacher was appointed chaplain at the Charity Hospital of Berlin, a position which he continued to fill, up to 1802. During these six years of stay in Berlin he moved chiefly in the learned and cultivated circles of the Prussian capital, and identified himself, for a time, with the so-called Romantic School of Poetry, as represented by Frederick and William Schlegel, Tieck and Novalis. It was chiefly through an attachment he had formed for Frederick Schlegel that he became, from the first, so interested in the ideas and sentiments of the Romantic School, and this acquaintance with Schlegel very greatly influenced the early development of his character and abilities, and left with him, in after years, an abiding impress. This influence upon the one hand roused Schleiermacher to a knowledge of his own strength, and indicated an avenue for its display; but, upon the other hand it was by no means favorable to deep spirituality, since Frederick Schlegel lacked in moral tone, as Schleiermacher himself afterwards discovered. It was owing to this lack of moral tone, as we can only believe, that Schlegel could conceive the project of the idealization of sensuality, as he did in his repugnant and shameless novel named the "Lucinde." Such an attempt at first seemed to Schleiermacher improper; but at this time the ideas of the Romantic School had taken such hold upon him, that his sense of propriety was, it seems to us, wonderfully clouded, if one might judge him in the light of his subsequent career. So obscured was it, that when the *Lucinde* was condemned on all sides as a book of an immoral character, and its author denounced as an outcast from society, Frederick Schleiermacher came forward, covertly to be sure, but, nevertheless, in fact, as the advocate of this proscribed book. His endorsement upon this occasion was no doubt ow-

ing to the friendship that he entertained for the author, and also partly, as is believed, on account of his dislike, at the time, for the empty conventionalities of social intercourse, and the lifeless forms of assumed morality. But it is after all very hard to reconcile these letters of Schleiermacher endorsing the *Lucinde*, with the splendid productions of his genius in later life; and we may as well allow at once that they remain a blot upon his character down to the present time.

In 1799, while the literary influence of Weimar was still at its height, he published his first important work, the Discourses on Religion, addressed to the educated amongst its despisers (*Reden über die Religion an die Gebildeten unter ihren Verdächtern*). These produced a stirring effect upon the rising generation of theologians, as Neander and Harms from their different stand-points testify, and seem to mark the transition of German theology from an age of cold speculation to the restoration of positive faith. The discourses, written to arouse the German mind to self-consciousness, have been compared in their effect, in a religious point of view, with that subsequently produced, in a political view, by Fichte's noble and patriotic addresses to the German nation. Schleiermacher in these discourses appeals like an eloquent high-priest of natural religion, in the outer court of the Christian revelation, to convince educated unbelievers that religion far from being incompatible with intellectual culture, as they supposed, was the deepest and most universal want of man, and one that consists neither in knowledge nor in action, but in a sacred feeling of dependence upon the Infinite which purifies and ennobles all the faculties. Designed thus, as were the discourses, to demonstrate by arguments of reason the necessity of religion for man, they were rather a treatise on the philosophy of religion, than a theological work; and they were even at first mistaken by the author's friend, Dr. Sack, as a designed pleading on the side of Pantheistic views, such as had then become current among writers of the Romantic school. With many of these writers Schleiermacher had become personally familiar since his settlement in Berlin (F. Schlegel was one of this school);

and Dr. Sack, who was aware of these connections and who had long seen them with uneasiness, was easily betrayed into the suspicion that his friend had become tainted with the false principles of the literary and scientific circles in which he moved so freely, the more especially, as certain portions of the Discourses had the appearance of looking that way. As a striking instance of this, his commendation of Spinoza was held up to view. "Offer," says he, "reverentially, with me a lock of hair to the manes of the holy but proscribed Spinoza. The divine Spirit transfused him, the infinite was his beginning and end, the universe was his only and everlasting love. In holy innocence and deep humility he mirrored himself in the eternal world, and saw also how he was its noblest mirror. Full of religion was he, and full of a holy Spirit, and, therefore, he stands alone and unrivaled, master in his art but exalted above profane society, without disciples and without even citizenship.

Schleiermacher, however, assured Dr. Sack, that he had entirely misapprehended the philosophical language he had made use of, and instead of corrupting religion with pantheistic metaphysics, his aim and object had been to prove the independence of religion over against all metaphysics whatever, and thus to rescue it from the storms of philosophical opinion which were then raging.

The late Mr. Vaughan in speaking of this work says: "In these essays Schleiermacher meets the Rationalist objector on his own ground. In what aspect, he asks, have you considered religion that you so despise it? Have you looked on its outward manifestations only? These, the peculiarities of an age or a nation may modify. You should have looked deeper. That which constitutes the religious life has escaped you. Your criticism has dissected a dead creed. That scalpel will never detect a soul. Or will you aver, that you have indeed looked upon religion in its inward reality? Then you must acknowledge that the idea of religion is inherent in human nature; that it is a great necessity of our kind. Your quarrel lies in this case, not with religion itself, but with the corruptions of

it. In the name of humanity you are called on to examine closely, to appreciate duly what has been already done towards the emancipation of the true and eternal, which lies beneath these forms, to assist in the preservation of what may yet remain. Schleiermacher separates the province of religion from those of action and of knowledge. Religion is not morality, it is not science. Its seat is found accordingly in the third element of our nature—the feeling. Its essential is a right state of the heart. To degrade religion to the position of a mere purveyor of motive to morality is not more dishonorable to the ethics which must ask, than to the religion which renders such assistance. \* \* \* The feeling Schleiermacher advocated is not the fanaticism of the ignorant, or the visionary emotion of the idler. It is not an aimless reverie shrinking morbidly from the light of clear and definite thought. Feeling in its sound condition affects both our conception and our will; leads to knowledge and to action. Neither knowledge nor morality are, in themselves, the measure of a man's religiousness. Yet religion is requisite to true wisdom, and morality inseparable from true religion. He points out the hurtfulness of a union between Church and State. With indignant eloquence he descants on the evils which have befallen the Church, since first the hem of the priestly robe swept the marble of the imperial palace."

In the estimation of Schleiermacher, religion being subjective, it may consist of innumerable varieties. As the universe can be viewed from various stand-points, and thereby different impressions of it be received, so we acquire a diversity of conceptions of religion: hence the numerous forms of it that have existed. In each breast is found a religion, derived from the objects of its intellectual and spiritual vision. The religion of Christ is the great sum flowing from the contrast of the finite and the infinite, the human and the divine. Of all religions the latter alone can lay claims to universal adaptation and to rightful sovereignty. The founder of Christianity was the revealer of a system more advanced than either Polytheism or Judaism. It is only by accepting it in the simple manner in



which its author promulgated it, that the mind can in confidence rest in its efforts to find a basis of faith. Important, nevertheless, as this religion is, it will little avail unless it become the heart-property of each theoretical believer.

These Discourses of Schleiermacher were what the times needed, and perhaps no line of metaphysical argumentation could have had so powerful an influence upon the classes they were intended to affect. They produced in the minds of the educated and skeptical what was most of all needed—a sense of dependence upon infinite existence. Many of those who had defied reason closed the volume after having perused it, and reflected with themselves how strange it was that they should till then have ignored the feelings of the heart. Many, with rationalistic principles, acquiesced in the views of the discourses, because their natures longed to meet with some system to fill the void that had been produced by the destructive theology of the age. They wished for something of a positive character. For this they were directed in these discourses of Schleiermacher to the Christian religion as the great illuminator in the heavens, and to the heart as the organ fitted to receive its light. The effect produced by this youthful effort of Schleiermacher can never be too highly estimated. And although the author found much to correct in subsequent editions; yet the necessity which called them forth was sufficient justification for any errors that crept into them. His utterances were the enthusiastic expressions of youthful genius, and in after years, he admitted that the work had grown strange to him. As if, therefore, anxiously careful of his reputation, he appended copious notes in order to make his earlier and later views harmonize. There seems, however, to have been no occasion for all this. It was the severe and virulent censures, however, of a certain class of ecclesiastical critics, heaped upon him on account of the traces of Spinozism that were supposed to lurk in them, which, no doubt, had much to do in inducing him to append the explanatory notes that are found in the later editions of the discourses. Pantheistic or, otherwise, these discourses produced their desired result, and even long since

the author's pen has been stilled, they have led many a doubter in from the cold blasts of unbelief, and given him a place at the warm and cheerful fireside of conscious repose. Of books, as of men, our estimate should be formed according to the purpose creating and the moral results following them. Neander, a competent judge as to the influence of the discourses, speaks of them in the following language: "Those who at that time belonged to the rising generation will well remember with what power this book influenced the minds of the young, being written in all the vigor of youthful enthusiasm and bearing witness to the neglected, undeniable religious element in human nature. That which constitutes the peculiar characteristic of religion, namely, that it is an independent element in human nature, had fallen into oblivion by a one-sided rational or speculative tendency, or a one-sided disposition to absorb it in ethics. Schleiermacher had touched a note which, especially in the minds of youth was sure to send forth its melody over the land. Men were led back into the depth of their heart to perceive there a divine drawing which, when once called forth, might lead them beyond that which the author of this impulse had expressed with distinct consciousness."

In the year following the publication of the Discourses on Religion Schleiermacher issued his *Monologues*; in which, it has been said, he gave the key-note to the century; and which forms in some sort a counterpart to the earlier work. While the Discourses served to set forth his idea of religion as centering in the feeling of dependence, the Monologues brought into view his idea of the ethical nature of man, centering in the consciousness of freedom. They have been characterized as "a self-contemplation in the face of the world, and a description of the ethical ideal which floated before his mind, and was evidently influenced by the subjective idealism of Fichte."

In 1802, Schleiermacher removed from Berlin to Stolpe, in Pomerania, in the character of a royal chaplain, and thus severed his connection from his æsthetic and literary companions. This change of residence is regarded on all hands as having contributed quite as much toward his subsequent moral and

spiritual development, as his removal from Barby had done toward his intellectual life. He remained at Stolpe two years, during which time he finished and brought out his elaborate and searching criticism of all past systems of morals (*Kritik aller bisherigen Sittenlehre*), the first of his works that had a strict philosophical form. Here, also, he began the translation of Plato, which he projected with Frederick Schlegel, in Berlin. This work was completed in six volumes, and was issued from 1804 to 1826, and gave its author a rank among the best Greek scholars of Germany.

In 1804, he was invited to occupy a theological chair at Wurtzburg, and had resolved to accept it; but the King of Prussia withheld his permission, and bestowed upon him instead a chair of theology at Halle, to which he removed during the year. He was at the same time appointed University preacher, and both his lectures and his sermons excited in all the students the warmest interest and enthusiasm. "I recollect very well," says Dr. Lücke, "how, at the time, some of my elder fellow-students, returning from Halle, spoke with enthusiastic praises of the new light that had arisen for them in the person of Schleiermacher. But so profound and original a thinker was not easily understood. By some he was mistaken for a Spinozist, and by others for a Pietist. The professors of the University were as much divided about him as the students; Niemeyer and Vatter stood by him, while Knapp and Nösselt stood aloof. Toward the end of the year 1805 he wrote his Christmas-Festival. (*Weihnachtsfeier*), a dialogue. His treatise on the Epistle of Timothy made its appearance about this time; and this was the first fruits of his studies in the department of scientific criticism and exegesis.

In October, 1806, in consequence of the disastrous defeat of the Prussians in the battle of Jena, Saxony lay open to the conqueror, and the city of Halle became part of the victor's spoils. The lectures of the University were interrupted and finally suspended by the French invasion, and Schleiermacher suffered not a little hardship at the hands of the plundering parties of the enemy who entered Halle. His purse was near-

ly empty, and his health greatly suffered from the spare diet rendered necessary by the high prices of provisions. But the stern will of Schleiermacher refused to bow to the invader. He declined, when required to do so, to offer up public prayers for the new King and Queen of Westphalia, and, throwing up his academic offices, he quitted Halle about the close of 1807, and set out for Berlin. Here he found employment for a time, partly in preaching and in the delivery of theological and philosophical lectures; and partly in the execution of several political missions, which he undertook in the interest of his oppressed King and country. The year 1808 was for his native land a year of deep humiliation. Bowed beneath the power of France, Prussian nationality was threatened with destruction, and the power of Napoleon seemed invincible. The lofty spirit and stern resolve of Schleiermacher would not allow him to feel humbled, and in the midst of the deepest calamities of his country his countenance ever beamed with expressions of benignity and hopefulness. He united himself during these perilous times to that band of German braves and patriots, who cherished and kept alive the spirit of Prussian liberty and labored for the coalition which afterwards broke the oppressor's yoke. His sentiments and actions became widely known, and he was at length placed upon the list of Marshal Davoust as one of those active and unruly German spirits that should be brought under the strictest surveillance.

The year 1809 was, in a two-fold sense, for Schleiermacher one of realization. His long cherished desire to enter the holy circle of family union was in May of this year gratified. He married the youthful widow of his deceased clerical friend, Willich, with whom, notwithstanding the great disparity of their years, he lived happily till the close of his life. The other object realized in accordance with his wishes was the establishment of the university in the Prussian capital. Frederick William III, in the midst of national disaster and humiliation, had conceived the design of founding a university in Berlin, and this project met with universal favor among the educated classes. Schleiermacher, to stimulate and guide this im-

portant design, had, in 1808, published his "Occasional Thoughts on Universities in a German Sense." In the meanwhile he was appointed preacher in the Church of the Trinity in Berlin, where his eloquence and originality attracted audiences from the highest and most lettered classes of that enlightened capital, and now, when the new institution was founded, he was fixed upon to occupy one of its principal chairs. He was chosen the first theological professor in the university, and this position he continued to retain during the remainder of his life.

In 1810 the university was opened, and Schleiermacher found himself at the head of one of the most brilliant theological faculties that Germany had yet produced, including Neander, De Wette and Marheineke; and associated with such men in the other faculties as Fichte, Buttman, Böckh and Lachmann. It is generally admitted that the splendid success of the University during its earlier decenniums, and the commanding position it assumed, from the very first, among the German seats of learning, was very much due to the genius of Schleiermacher, both as an original thinker and an eloquent professor. To his academic employments, which included the office of University preacher, he added others which greatly extended the sphere of his influence and usefulness. He was for several years connected with the educational department of the Ministry of the Interior, and in 1814 was made Secretary of the Royal Academy of Sciences, to which he contributed many philosophical papers. He was now at the zenith of his official life, and had yet a twenty years' course of high public usefulness before him. These were years of indefatigable labor, of constant intellectual, theological and spiritual progress and of immense literary fecundity.

In 1811 appeared his brief outline of theological study, (*Darstellung des Theologischen Studiums*).<sup>\*</sup> "Only a few sheets," exclaims Lücke speaking of it, "but a whole world of new thoughts! For the first time, theology appears here as

---

<sup>\*</sup> This work has been translated into English by Farrar, to which is prefixed a version of Lücke's Reminiscences of Schleiermacher.

an organic whole, looking throughout to the practical administration of the Church." In a remarkable manner were perceived in this production the systematic acuteness and sagacity of Schleiermacher, and also the clear penetration of his whole theological system from the practical religious principle. In the year 1817, he published his essay upon the Gospel of Luke, a work pregnant with observations and reflections, and an important contribution toward the solution of the difficult question as to the origin of this Gospel.

In 1821-2 appeared his Christian Dogmatics (*Der Christliche Glaube nach den Grundsätzen der Evangelischen Kirche im Zusammenhange dargestellt*). This was the master production and great crowning work of Schleiermacher, from the appearance of which a new era in theology is dated. The work made its appearance in the midst of the conflicts between rationalism and supernaturalism. These terms had been appropriated by theologians from the Kantian philosophy, and designated for some time the two principal divisions of the theological schools. To merge the two antagonistic schemes into a new system, which should acknowledge the claims of both, was the main object which Schleiermacher had in view in this last and greatest production of his pen. The system unfolded in this work was, unquestionably, one of the most important ever conceived by man. Without attempting to trace its growth in the mind of its author, it will be sufficient to define its general nature in its destructive and constructive aspects.

He lays down these two fundamental principles, viz: 1st. That truth in theology is not attainable by reason, as the rationalists had ever contended, but by a certain insight which he called the Christian consciousness; and 2d. That piety consists in spiritual feeling, and not in morality. Both these flow necessarily as corollaries from his philosophical principles.

There are two parts, both in the intellectual and in the emotional branches of our nature. In the emotional, a feeling of dependence in the presence of the Infinite, which is the seat of religion, and a consciousness of power, which is the source of

action and the seat of morality. In the intellectual, a faith or intuition which apprehends God and truth, and critical faculties which act upon the matter presented and form science. In making these distinctions, Schleiermacher struck a blow at rationalism, which had identified on the one hand religion and morality, and on the other intuition and reason. Hence, from this point of view, he was led to explain Christianity, when contrasted with other religions, subjectively, on the emotional side, as the most perfect state of the feeling of dependence; and on the intellectual side, as the intuition of Christianity and Christ's work; and the organ of truth in Christianity was held to be the special form of insight which apprehends Christ; just as natural intuition apprehends God; which insight was called the Christian consciousness. Thus far, it is believed, many will agree with him. No better analysis of the religious faculties was, perhaps, ever given. Religion is thus placed on a new basis; a home was found for it in the human mind distinct from reason. Rationalism was shown to be untrue in its psychology. The distinctness of religion, the reality of spiritual insight and sympathy with Christian life, were asserted to be as necessary for appreciating Christianity, as æsthetic insight for art.

In his construction of Christian truth, Schleiermacher follows out here the same principles as before. As he held the intuitions of human nature to be the last appeal of truth in art or morals, so he made the collective Christian consciousness the last appeal in Christianity. The dependence on apostolic teaching, therefore, was not an appeal to external authority, but merely to that which was the best exponent of the early religious consciousness of Christendom in its purest age. The New Testament was written for believers, appealing to their religious consciousness, not dictating to it. Inspiration is reduced thus, not indeed to mere genius, but to the religious consciousness; and is different only in degree, and not in kind, from the pious intuitions of saintly men. The Bible becomes the record of religious truth, not its vehicle; a witness of the Christian consciousness of apostolic times, not an external



standard for all time. Acquiescence in the views thus held and expressed by Schleiermacher was the virtual abandonment to rationalistic criticism of much held sacred by theologians up to that time; but his strong dialectic acumen perceived that this sacrifice was necessary, in order to save the essential in Christianity from entire destruction.

From this point we may see how his views of doctrine, as well as his criticism of Scripture, were influenced by his theory. For in his view of fundamental doctrines, such as sin and the redeeming work of Christ, inasmuch as his appeal was made to the collective Christian consciousness, those aspects of doctrine only were regarded as important, or even real, which were appreciated by the consciousness or understood by it. Sin was accordingly viewed rather as hurtfulness than as guilt before God; redemption, rather as sanctification than as justification. Christ's death was looked upon as a mere subordinate act in His life of self-sacrifice. Atonement was considered to be the exhibition of the union of God with man; and the mode of arriving at a state of salvation, a realization of the union of man with God, through a kind of mystical conception of the brotherhood of Christ.

In accordance with his system, the dogmatic reality of such doctrines as the Trinity was weakened. The deity of the Son, as distinct from His superhuman character, became unimportant, save as the historical embodiment of the ideal union of God and humanity. The Spirit was viewed not as a personal agent, but as a living activity, having its seat in the Christian consciousness of the Church. The objective in each case was absorbed in the spiritual, as previously in rationalism it had been degraded into the natural. It followed, also, that the Christian consciousness, thus able to find, as it were, a philosophy of religion and of the substantial truth apprehended by the consciousness of inspired men, possessed an instinct to distinguish the unimportant in Scripture, and might make more of the eternal ideas contained in it, than of the historic garb under which they were presented.

The ideological tendency is inspired by the natural longing

of the philosophic mind, that tries to rise beyond facts into their causes, and seeks to penetrate behind phenomena into ideas. This tendency arises in a country, as for example in ancient Greece, when the popular creed and the scientific no longer harmonize. Suggested in Germany by the Rationalists, it had been especially stimulated by the subjective philosophy of Kant and Fichte. Historic facts were made to be the expression of subjective forms of thought. This theory, suggested to Schleiermacher from without, fell in with his own views as above developed, and affected his critical inquiries. In the controversy as to the composition of the Gospels, he was led by his ideological theory, and his instinctive perception of the relative importance of doctrines in theological perspective, to abandon the historical importance of miracles as compared with doctrine, and also the verity of the early history of Christ's life regarded in the light of a mere tradition.

Schleiermacher disclaimed any great authority for the Old Testament in the following language: "The Old Testament Scriptures are indebted for their place in our Bible, partly to the appeals made to them by the New Testament Scriptures, and partly to the historic connection of Christian worship and the Jewish synagogue, without participating on that account in the normal dignity or inspiration of those of the New Testament. As far as the inspiration of the Old Testament is concerned, there must be a distinction observed between the law and the prophets. The law cannot be inspired, for the spirit that could inspire it would be in conflict with that which God sends into the heart, by virtue of our connection with Christ. Upon the law depend all the subsequent historical books; and both are, therefore, uninspired, according to the standard by which we judge the New Testament. The prominent portions of the prophetic writings proceed principally from the material spirit of the people, which is not the Christian spirit."

It was in his Dogmatics that the influence of Schleiermacher was most deeply and profoundly felt. Gass, writing to the author, expresses himself as to the importance of this work in the following words: "I have never found in any work, not

even in any from yourself, such pure pleasure as in this ; and I will add also, that I have never enjoyed so much my being a Christian and a minister, as in its perusal. No one will persuade me that a new epoch is not to commence with your Dogmatics, not only in this study, but in the entire range of theological science." Since the appearance of Calvin's Institutes, no dogmatic work has appeared, which has been so comprehensive and startling in its announcements ; none that has been so potent in the development of new forms of theological thought.

It was not alone in the department of theology that the towering intellect of Schleiermacher manifested itself. As a philosopher he ranks with Fichte, Schelling and Hegel ; yet, he could not, with these great thinkers, persuade himself to abandon all belief in the external. He was, as already intimated, more strongly influenced, perhaps, by Fichte, than by any other modern philosopher since Kant. He freed himself, nevertheless, from Fichte's unsatisfactory idealism, by adopting a real reciprocal action of thinking and being, and returned to Kant's view of the world, in which there still lay a sensational element derived from Locke ; while yet he agreed with Fichte, in adopting, as that author did in the earlier portion of his career, an independent, individual personality. At the same time, also, he adopted a real connection of this personality with a single, absolute, primeval cause ; and still more strongly did he insist upon this connection as being manifested in direct feeling. His adoption of an empirical element in our knowledge, does not, however, place him upon the same stand-point with Kant ; and still less back of this upon the position taken by the sensational school ; for he differs from the latter class of philosophers in advocating idealistic notions, in opposition to those of the materialists. He also differed from Kant, where he assumes that the *noumenon*, or intrinsic nature of things, may be cognized by us, as he wished to establish an adequate knowledge, together with objective validity, in place of the bare possibility of knowing only phenomena. It was his aim to establish this real knowledge upon the supposition of a general fundamental substance, common to the subject and the ob-

ject, in and by which, a real influence of things upon the mind or inversely may supervene; whereby only, as he supposed, a mediation of knowledge in us by means of things, and an objective activity of the will upon things, becomes comprehensible.

The assumption of this fundamental essence is that which brought Schleiermacher into such close relationship with Schelling, Fichte and Spinoza. In his view of this essence or substance, the dualism of thinking and being is reduced, at bottom, to a unity; all antagonism of these is in reality removed, and is met with only in the world of finite essences. This unity of idealism and realism Schleiermacher called his philosophical stand-point; and having had his attention directed to the point, by Jacobi, he at once admitted in his mind an association with the doctrine of the "holy but proscribed Spinoza," in which he believed that he had found a solid and substantial basis. He likewise availed himself the more readily of Spinoza's doctrine of the All-one, as it afforded him a point of support for the hypothesis of his religious principle—the *absolute feeling of dependence*. We do not meet in him, however, that decided pantheism which regards the absolutely and singly existing substance as the essence of all things, and the things as mere abstract forms devoid of essence and transitory, in which the substance as the eternal and divine alone exists; in such sense that a world as distinguishable from God has no existence whatever. A pantheism of such acosmic character was not accepted by Schleiermacher. In his view the absolute substance, or the absolute in the strictest sense of the word, is a unity that excludes from itself all differences, determinations, and actions, and in which, when we endeavor to think of it, the power of framing conceptions comes to an end; since we can only think of the definite, the formal, of that the limits of which are set in distinction from something else. This substance, which is not to be thought of in any definite sense, and is to be uttered only negatively, or as to what it is not, is, nevertheless, a necessary hypothesis of all definite being and knowledge, as also of all action of things upon one another,

and of the intelligence upon material things, and is thus an altogether necessary postulate for all knowledge and all active volition. But Schleiermacher did not, like Spinoza, regard this divine substance as entering into finite things and constituting the essence of the existence of all things in the aggregate; with him, rather, all finite things taken together are and remain the complex, only of finite natures, and this complex is the universe or world. Thus, the world is opposed to the infinite in like manner, as the many are to the one, and is in no-wise identical with God. From the infinite in itself he regarded every quality of distinction, both that of things among themselves, as also that of thinking and being, or of intelligence and virtue, as in the strictest manner excluded. In this way the world obtains upon its side a certain relative independence, as the totality of everything definite, finite and changeable.

Schleiermacher, after a busy life of literary, theological and philosophical activity, died February 12th, 1834, and his death spread a gloom over all Germany. It was felt that a towering intellect had passed away, and his funeral was one of the largest that Berlin had ever witnessed. His thoughts left their abiding impress upon the age, and his opinions continued to be the subject of diligent study, and to have their influence in different directions. All the youthful German scholars of his time were influenced by him in their modes of thinking, and although now dead near forty years, his power is still widely felt. The mediation school of theology regards him as its founder. It is even believed that his thinking, in its effects, is not altogether dissimilar to that of Emanuel Swedenborg, though to the superficial observer this may be difficult to be perceived.

As a preacher, as a professor, and as an author, Schleiermacher was alike highly distinguished; always like himself, and always unlike everybody else—conspicuously independent, individual, or to use his own favorite term, subjective. Whatever he took into his own thoughts from the thoughts of others, was reproduced with the sharp imprint upon it of his own strongly-marked idiosyncrasy. Speaking of his intellectual

habits, Lücke, who was one of his most eminent disciples, remarks that "the natural habit and certainty of his mental movements go a great way to explain the immense extent of all that he produced and accomplished. What he wrote for the press had been previously so well considered and prepared, even with regard to the form that (since he always possessed at the same time a mastery of language), he never had occasion to strike out anything. None of his sermons, none of his lectures cost him more time than was requisite for a thorough meditation. A small scrap of paper sufficed for his memoranda, even in his lectures, such as those upon the history of philosophy. Thus, in every labor, by his various proficiencies, he saved time and spirits for new intellectual acquisitions and new exertions. His bodily constitution was naturally weak and delicate—yea, even sickly. But what a mastery he exercised over it; compelling it even in its sickly states to be the servant of his mind! This Socratic mastery and might of the spirit over the body was a part of his inmost nature, and secured to him in age that renewed youth with which, even to his latest breath, he maintained so lively a participation both in the earnest labor and in the cheerful enjoyment of life."

The theological teaching of Schleiermacher is constantly referred to in Germany as having created a new epoch in the Protestant Church. He very early apprehended the great problem of uniting, without confusion and without mutual injury and hinderance, free scientific investigation with that piety which flows from the teaching of Christ, in such manner that the hostility and contradictions, in which they had become involved by the movements of the age, should increasingly disappear. The solution of this problem was for him the work of his whole life.

In one sense Schleiermacher may be said to have founded a school of disciples, inasmuch as from his first appearance at Halle, he assembled around him, by means of his discourses and writings, a multitude of enthusiastic hearers and admirers, who afterwards continued to work in his spirit. He wished to found no other kind of school. A school that with conscious

purpose makes its appearance as a party, secludes itself within a certain method, and excludes every modifying influence from without, he did not desire to establish. Notwithstanding the strength and keenness of his integrity, his regard for the Church and for science was too great to permit his doing so, as was likewise his intellect too free and comprehensive. His chief object was to form every one to be a seeker after truth in earnestness and love; to make the individuality of each so free and vigorous that he should be able freely to possess the truth after his own fashion. Free, independent disciples were what he sought to attract; slavish repeaters and imitators inspired him with disgust.

---

ART. V.—THE WESTERN LITURGY.

---

*A Liturgy or Order of Worship for the Reformed Church,  
Cincinnati: T. P. Bucher, Publisher, 1869.*

---

This work was prepared and published under the direction of the two District-Synods of the Reformed Church, the Ohio and the North West. At the meeting of the General Synod in Philadelphia, held in November, 1869, permission was given to use it in the Church at large. This permission was not designed to express any opinion or judgment in particular on the work, for it received no particular examination nor discussion of its merits in the General Synod. The permission amounted simply to this,—that until the Church is prepared to unite freely on the adoption of one Liturgy, a certain amount of liberty shall be allowed on this subject; and when a large section of the Church, such as that represented by these two Synods, request permission to use a liturgy prepared and sanctioned by them, the General Synod grants the request without expressing any particular judgment on the work.

This introduction of the Western liturgy differs very much from the manner in which the Order of Worship of the East



obtained permission of the General Synod at Dayton to be used in our Churches and families. This latter received a thorough examination and discussion, and the permission for its unrestricted use was the result of a judgment which declared it a proper book for the purpose for which it was prepared. The friends of the Eastern liturgy did not indeed ask for such endorsement; they asked merely for permission to use their work; but the opposition forced a discussion which really brought about a decision on its merits.\* So far as the privilege to use it is concerned, the Western liturgy stands on an equality with the Eastern, but so far as any criticism or judgment outside of the two Synods which prepared it is concerned, it has received none.

It seems to us that it should receive a fuller notice both of its merits and demerits than it has yet received. It forms one of the landmarks in the history of our Reformed Church in this country, and is an exponent of a certain type of theological thinking. Its appearance, and the action allowing its use taken by the General Synod, bring the liturgical movement before us in a somewhat new phase. That movement is now freed from much of the acrimony generated by the supposition that an effort was being made to force a liturgy upon the Church. It is now seen that no such design was ever entertained, and that the alarm created by the supposition referred to was groundless. If the Western liturgy had appeared earlier as was promised and expected, we would have been saved much bitter controversy on this point. Now that it is thus seen that the Reformed Church possesses the same freedom in the progress and development of its liturgical tendencies that

---

\* This may serve to explain what is sometimes paraded as a contradiction, viz., that in the discussion at Dayton the friends of the *Order of Worship* did not claim that permission to use it involved an endorsement of all its contents, but that since then they refer to the work as having received such endorsement. The opponents of the book took the position that such permission *would* carry with it an endorsement, and hence they joined issue in discussing its orthodoxy. This brought on a discussion which for earnestness and ability has perhaps never been excelled in any public discussion in the history of the Reformed Church in this country. The result was a full vindication of the orthodoxy of the *Order of Worship*.

it has always possessed, we are in a better condition to study the question calmly and dispassionately. No one will imagine that there is a purpose in what is written upon it, to influence any particular legislation or gain a victory except for the cause of truth.

In this notice of the Western liturgy we shall direct attention first to some of its merits, and then to some of its defects and short-comings, with a view to contribute to the cause of truth in the progress of the liturgical movement in our Church.

No one can examine this liturgy without being impressed with the advanced position which it occupies as compared with what is known as the *Mayer Liturgy*, for a long time in use in the Reformed Church. It opens with a recognition of the *Church Year*, with its great festivals, and the intervening Sundays as these are related to these festivals. This is a great advance on the custom of the more recent fathers, at least in the English portion of the Church,—so much so as to involve a great innovation, if not an entire revolution in our order of worship. Within our own lifetime the whole conception of such a thing as the Church Year had so far died out in many sections of the Church that scarcely a trace of it was left. In the most Eastern portion of East Pennsylvania where we were raised, we neither learned nor heard of such a year, and the festivals had so lost all their religious significance, that we only knew of one or two, Christmas and Easter, and if the former came on a week-day, and any service was held, it was one of the poorest services in the year. The others still came to our hearing in their German names, but to think of keeping them was regarded as an old German superstition. And the same state of things had doubtless come to exist in other English congregations in the Church. Now we open this Western liturgy, and we find the whole Church Year spread out before us, at least as an index, in the opening pages of the book. There are the Movable Feasts from 1870 to 1900, Septuagesima Sunday, Ash Wednesday, Easter, Ascension Day, Pentecost, and there are all the Sundays set forth by their appro-

priate names as they stand in the Church Year. To fill out the Church Year in our worship involves an entire revolution in the order in which we were taught to worship in our childhood. Yet we hail this as a wholesome innovation, a substantial progress, whose effect for good will be realized as we live on through these golden cycles of the Church Year.

Here also we find a table of the old Pericopes, or Scripture Lessons, which have come down to us from the early centuries of the Christian Church. With these, too, we had no acquaintance in our early life, except as we saw them indicated in the Almanac, as mysterious in their meaning then as the names of the Saints' days found there. This table at least indicates the order according to which the Church in the ages of old presented the Gospel. Starting here in Advent we are led on by the Scripture lessons through the whole cycle of Christianity, from its beginnings in the Incarnation to its end in the glorification of our Lord, and of all His saints. Scripture here is made to stand in its true order for the use of the Church. Where this is followed, we are delivered from that arbitrary, lawless, method of using Scripture both for reading and preaching which prevails where the Church Year has past out of mind. We commend this liturgy for restoring even this record of the old Scripture Lessons.

Next is given, The Order for the Regular Service on the Lord's Day. This begins by pronouncing one of the seventeen invocations that are given ("the minister *shall* arise and *pronounce* one of the following invocations or salutations"), next follows the singing of a psalm or hymn, after which the minister shall read the Scripture lessons, which *may* be the Gospel and Epistle for the day. Then comes the General Prayer, which *may* also be one of the four subsequently given, after which another hymn is sung, then the sermon, then a prayer which *may* be one also furnished, then a hymn, ending with the *Gloria Patri*, or an appropriate Doxology. (Query. Is the *Gloria Patri* not an appropriate doxology?). The service is closed with one of the benedictions following, which the minister *shall* pronounce.

What we can commend here is that an order is provided for the regular service, and forms given for *all* the parts, though the rubrics direct that some of them, the invocations and benedictions, *shall* be used, and others, as the prayers, *may* be used. There is progress here also, for our old liturgy, if we remember rightly, gave no order or forms for the regular Lord's day service. It will be perfectly in order, according to this service, if the minister sees proper, to use the prayers furnished. This at least concedes the principle that it is right and proper to use pre-composed prayers in the Lord's-day service, both before and after the sermon. It seems to indicate, too, that the invocation and benediction are significant priestly acts, the words of which ought to be rightly ordered, and not left to be extemporized by the minister officiating. To show also that provision can be made for special occasions (which some argue can be provided for only *extempore*), there are prayers for festival days, for days of fasting, humiliation, etc., for public thanksgiving, harvest festivals, etc., and for what are still further regarded as special occasions, such as the election of elders and deacons, opening of Synod, etc.

We are glad to find, in the next place, the ancient Liturgical Forms, the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene Creed, the Athanasian Creed, the Gloria Patri, Gloria in Excelsis, Te Deum Laudamus, and the Litany.

From this out the Offices are fixed, for Baptism, the Lord's Supper, Confirmation, &c., &c. Here, then, is *an order*, as the title of the book gives out, for the whole round of Church service.

It must be apparent, however, that, judged from its own stand-point, it is only a tentative effort, and not a finished production. The fact that it presents a number of forms for the same office, and that the rubrics then give permission to use any one, or none, shows this. It may indeed be said that the principle of the book is, that the forms of worship may be varied, and that none should be binding, but that the minister should be allowed, whenever he sees proper, to extemporize his own forms, and that, therefore, it is consistent with itself. This,

however, is a fallacy. We grant that a Church may allow to its ministers the choice, either to use its order of worship, or to modify it, or not to use its forms at all, but such permission should come from the Synod if it is deemed proper, and not from the liturgy itself. This should be complete in itself, giving what it regards the best order and form of service, and not waver as to what it regards the most suitable form, provided a precomposed order is to be used at all. We stand here by the position we took at the Synod at Dayton, that a liturgy cannot provide for what is called free service without contradicting itself, for the very idea of a liturgy is that it provides a service to be used. How then can it, consistently with itself, attempt to provide by rubrics what each minister is to extemporize for himself? What we mean is, that the book should give what it regards a complete service, the best that can be prepared, and leave the question of using it in whole, or in part, or not at all, for the Synod, or body entitled to give direction in regard to the matter. Otherwise you have only a compilation of forms for inspection and study by the minister, a contribution to Liturgies, rather than a liturgy proper. This is what we find, after all in this Lord's-day service. It contains material for a service, and by following one direction of the rubrics you can have a service, but by following another direction you have something else. It is in its own theological life what the Provisional Liturgy was in the East, incomplete, and needs to be revised, with a view to give it a unique and consistent character.

Let us notice some of the points on which it wavers, and see in what perplexity the minister is left in using it.

We commence at the first rubric. "*At the appointed hour the minister shall arise and pronounce one of the following Invocations or Salutations.*"

Shall he arise *at the Altar, or in the Pulpit?* This may seem an unimportant omission, and of no intentional significance. Yet we find in another rubric, in the Communion Service, where it might be supposed it would be less necessary, the direction is given as follows: "*Then the minister, taking his place at the*

table, shall, &c." We can hardly suppose that the committee that prepared this liturgy considered it a matter of no importance, whether the worship proper, or apart from the sermon, should be conducted at the altar or not. For this has been one of the subjects most seriously discussed in our liturgical controversy. We mean of course, not the mere fact of the minister standing at the altar, or in the pulpit, when he offers up the offering of prayer and praise, but, whether the worship shall circle around the holy eucharist or the sermon. This is a point of vital importance for a liturgy. It will in the end determine whether we shall get a true liturgy or a mere hand book for the pulpit.

We should think that, without even a thorough consideration of the subject, following only the earlier customs of worship in the Reformed Church, there would have been no difficulty in making this rubric a little more definite. And a reason might be found for so doing in the fact, that in later years we have fallen away from this custom of the fathers. Our older Churches, even in this country, had altars, and the minister conducted the service there.

We care not to go into a lengthy argument on this point, for it has been ably and fully discussed. How any one who studies the subject can fail to see that the offering of prayer connects itself with the Holy Communion, and so with the altar, and does not in the same way connect itself with the teaching function, and so with the pulpit, is a mystery to us. Yet, although nothing is said, we feel that the Lord's-day service of this Western liturgy is a pulpit service and not an altar service. We would like the book better if it had said this much. Then the issue would have been avowed as it clearly exists. On this issue we are quite willing to rest our criticism. We feel assured that when the subject is studied calmly, without prejudice, the decision of the Reformed Church will be to regard the altar and not the pulpit, the Holy Communion and not the Sermon, the central element of the service.

Growing out of this is another perplexity, already hinted at, in regard to the prayers for this Lord's-day service. These

prayers do not constitute a necessary part of the service, and hence they are placed in a collection in another place by themselves, to be called into use or not at the minister's pleasure. Is it then a matter of utter indifference whether the prayer for the regular service of the Lord's-day shall be one prepared and provided by the Church, or one extemporized by the minister officiating? Allowing that it is not, indeed, a question vital to true worship, yet a learned committee may be supposed to have a mind as to which would be preferable. Is the minister to decide on some principle for himself? or is it to be left to some trifling contingency, such as a weak frame of body, or dull frame of mind and spirit? Are these prayers to come in as occasional crotchets for the minister? or shall he make the use of them the rule and not the exception?

We confess that as a mere help for the minister, the reading of prayers from the pulpit, is to us the dullest and driest part of worship, and we do not wonder that our people often complain of *read prayers* in this sense. It seems to us like a liturgical patch set in an unliturgical garment. Especially is this the case when a variety of such prayers are given, and the people cannot anticipate what particular one is to be used. It is presumed that they are to follow it, for it is their prayer, as well as the minister's, and yet with this book before them at home, or in Church, just the one may be selected which they did not expect would be used. So far as their preparation for the prayer is concerned, the minister might as well extemporize a new and varied one every Sunday.

And this reveals still another preplexity in regard to this *regular* service. Is this service, after all, in any true sense, a service for the people, or only for the minister? We mean, so far as the book is concerned. Are the people expected to have the liturgy with them in Church? And are they to use it? For this, to our mind, will decide as to the chief reason for using pre-composed forms of prayer. Just here, although the preparation of these prayers might seem to intimate that they are for the people, the prescribed order seems to decide against them. There is not a word for them to utter, not even the



*Amen* at the end of the thanksgiving to which the Apostle refers. *There is no provision made*, so far as we have examined it, *in the whole book for a single response by the people*. The answers to certain questions in the Preparatory Service, as we shall show, is no exception to this remark.

It used to be said by certain persons, that responses were not objected to on principle, but that their use should be moderated, there should not be too many. Yet here we find them ruled out altogether. True, the people *may* join in repeating the Lord's prayer—but beyond this they are to be silent in all the prayers for the Lord's-day service, not even responding the *Amen*. How does this accord with the theory, that the people are all priests unto God, and that they are not to offer their prayers through the medium of another? How does it accord with a note to Professor Good's Inaugural on the Christian ministry, where it is said, "Neither hath God appointed any certain order of outward priesthood to make this sacrifice, (*i. e.*, the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving)"? Evidently here the theory breaks down. If the people are all priests, then it must follow that the minister is not to offer their prayers by proxy, but that they are to take part in the service.

We miss, of course, in this Lord's-day service the confession, the absolution, the Creed, and the Gloria in Excelsis, all familiar to the early Reformed liturgies. True the burdened heart may find somewhere in the minister's prayer, at the beginning, middle, or end, if it is not entirely omitted, a confession of sin in union with which he may send up his confession, and somewhere in the sermon may be dropped, if not the absolution, the comforting assurance of pardon, but how much more comforting is it to have provision made in a regular way for this? The Creed and the Gloria are postponed to extra occasions. But our limits will not allow us to dwell here. We go on to look somewhat into the doctrine and spirit of the offices for special occasions.

It is significant that the first of these is the office for Holy Baptism, placed here no doubt because this is the first sacrament which meets us in the order of our Christian life. But in

the order of worship the service for the Holy Communion stands central, and its celebration comprehends a whole service, and not merely a part, as is the case with Baptism, Confirmation, &c. But we take this Baptismal service where we find it.

We may remark here in general, that the theory of the sacraments which underlies this, and also the office for the Holy Communion, is that *they are institutions for teaching*, that they therefore have no specific character different from that of the preached word, and that their administration makes no room for a priestly office in the Church, but that they form only a part of the prophetic function of preaching. We shall find that this theory not only underlies these offices, but that such special effort is made to give it prominence, that it is even foisted in as a reason for the great commission, and for the solemn words of the Institution of the Holy Supper, in such a way as to perpetuate what seems to us a most gross perversion of the words of our Saviour. Let us quote from the opening words of this Baptismal service :

“Dearly beloved in the Lord, in the sacrament of holy baptism, which was instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ immediately before His ascension into heaven *we are taught and assured*, that although we are sinful and unholy, yet if we deplore our misery and sincerely turn to God, He will forgive our sins, renew our nature, and receive us again into His favor, for the sake of the one sacrifice of His beloved Son upon the Cross. ‘All power,’ said Jesus to His disciples, ‘is given unto me in heaven and on earth. Go ye therefore and teach’ (make disciples of?) ‘all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you : and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.’ (Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.) *To confirm us in the grace thus freely offered*, and to seal unto us the promise of the Gospel, He hath expressly commanded that we should be baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.”

Here we are told that the office of holy baptism is *to teach and assure* certain truths to us, viz : that if we deplore our

misery and sincerely turn to God, He will forgive our sins, renew our nature, and receive us again into His favor. Let us compare this with the first administration of this holy sacrament under the direction of the Apostle Peter on the day of Pentecost. On that occasion the Apostle preached to them the great truths of redemption through Christ, and when the people heard his words, "they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and to the rest of the Apostles, men and brethren, what shall we do? Then Peter said unto them, *Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.*" This is the first form of holy baptism ever used, and that by an inspired Apostle, under the great commission. Are we told here that Christ instituted this holy sacrament, in order that by it we may be taught and assured that God will forgive our sins, renew our nature, and receive us again into His favor? Did not St. Peter *teach* repentance and faith by his *preaching*? Would not any one interpret his words rather to mean, that through baptism they would receive,—not instruction, not an assurance,—but, *the forgiveness of sins, and the gift of the Holy Ghost*?

Or compare it with what St. Paul says of his own baptism, as he quotes the words of Ananias, "And now why tarriest thou? arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." Or again with the baptism of the eunuch, (Acts viii. 37, 38,) where it is said that under the preaching of Philip the eunuch *believed with all his heart*, nevertheless Philip baptized him.

So also this theory falls far short of the teaching of the Heidelberg Catechism, where we are taught that in baptism we have not only the assurance of pardon, but where this pardon is always joined with the washing with water, as an internal side of the sacrament. "Where has Christ promised"—not that we are as certainly taught and assured—but, "*that we are as certainly washed with His blood and Spirit as with the water of Baptism*?" In the institution of Baptism which reads thus, &c." Who cannot see a different interpretation of the great

commission here? Though the two sides of the sacrament are here distinguished, yet the one is joined to the other always. But in this liturgy the washing with water only teaches that God *will* do so and so, not that He *does* do thus.

And how are we to understand the words which follow the words of the Commission: "To confirm us in the grace thus freely offered, and to seal unto us the promise of the Gospel, He hath expressly commanded us to be baptized, &c." To confirm us in *what* grace thus freely offered? The words of the Commission are, "Go, ye, therefore, and make disciples of all nations, (by) baptizing them, &c., teaching them to observe all things, &c." The grace *thus* offered is clearly the grace of holy baptism itself. Then, to confirm us in the grace of baptism, of our being made disciples, we are to be baptized. What a contradiction and tautology this makes, not only in language, but in the teaching of our Saviour in regard to the sacrament! And all from an over-zealous, and officious, attempt to put a reason in the words of the Commission which our Saviour did not put there Himself.

In the next paragraph we are told that, "Whereas in all covenants there are contained two parts, we, on our part, accept with true repentance and faith the blessings so freely offered unto us; covenant and promise anew for ourselves and our children, &c., &c."

Here we have that pernicious theory of a covenant (*διαθήκη*), which regards it as a contract formed by two parties, the validity of which depends upon the consent and faithfulness of both. The covenant is God's own *Testament*, in the establishment of which man can have no part. "Thus saith the Lord: If ye can break my covenant of the day, and my covenant of the night, and that there should not be day and night in their seasons; then may also my covenant with David my servant be broken." What then signify the words, "We, on our part, covenant and promise anew, &c.?" Certainly man's faithfulness is required in order to enjoy the benefits of the covenant of God, but that covenant itself depends for its validity on no such condition. Just the opposite of this it is with which we

are confronted in baptism, viz., that although we are unworthy, yet God's covenant fails not.

In the prayer before baptism God is asked\* "to look graciously upon this child, and unite it by the Holy Ghost with Thy Son Jesus Christ, that being buried with him," (why is not the full quotation from Scripture made, by baptism, Rom. vi. 4?) "in his death, it may rise with him to newness of life, &c."; but in the post-baptismal thanksgiving we have no recognition of the fact that the child now baptized *has been, in its Baptism*, so united to Christ. Only the general thanksgiving is offered,— "We thank and praise Thee, that Thou dost forgive us and our children all our sins through the blood of Thy dear Son, and receive us among the number of Thy faithful people; and that Thou dost confirm and seal these blessings unto us in holy baptism." This last clause sounds well, but if it is heartily received there should have been no wavering in the thanksgiving, "that Thou *hast* confirmed and sealed these blessings unto this child."

Altogether we find in this office for holy baptism no acknowledgment of the proper grace of this sacrament. In several of the following forms there is an attempt to acknowledge something, but it only disappoints by its evasions. For instance; "Graciously bestow upon it *the blessings Thou dost impart in the lawful use of holy baptism.*" Again: "Grant that its baptism may be made effectual to the end for which it was instituted."

In the office for adult baptism we have the same interpolation of the reason why our Saviour gave the commission to His disciples. "To encourage us to seek for deliverance from this state

---

\* We are aware that these prayers before and after baptism are largely taken from the prayers in the baptismal service in the Palatinate liturgy, but there is just that part omitted which in that liturgy gave these words a definite meaning as referring to the burial in baptism, viz., this part: "O Almighty, everlasting God, who according to Thy strict judgment, didst punish the unbelieving and impenitent world by the Flood, but in Thy great mercy didst save believing Noah; and didst overthrow Pharaoh with all his host in the Red Sea; but didst lead Thy people Israel through on dry ground: *Whereby this Baptism was prefigured, &c.*" So in the post-baptismal thanksgiving the words are, "and *hast* sealed and confirmed all this (this grace) by holy Baptism, &c."

of ruin and misery, He promises unto us, if we repent and believe in Him, to grant unto us the remission of all our sins, for the sake of the one sacrifice which He offered upon the Cross, and to renew us by the Holy Spirit in His own likeness. *To confirm our faith in the exceeding great and precious promise*, he said unto His disciples: Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them, &c." Here is the same *tantalizing* spirit again. Salvation is a *promise*, the commission is to confirm our *faith in the promise*. Where, and when, in God's name, we may ask, is the *fulfillment* of the promise? Or are we still in Judaism, having *only* the promises?

Let us now take some notice of the service for the Holy Communion.

One of the chief elements in the service preparatory to the Holy Communion is the confession of sin. What strikes us as singular here is, that a confession to the minister is first required before it is made to God. Let us explain. After the address by the minister, *delivered in the chancel*, certain questions are propounded, requiring those who desire to join in the Holy Communion to answer audibly, whether they sincerely unite with the minister in confessing and deploring their sins, whether they heartily believe that Christ hath fully atoned for their sins, and whether they desire to lead new lives, renounce the world, &c. "As many of you, therefore, as thus sincerely feel and deplore your sins, and yet trust that God is merciful to you for Jesus' sake, and have formed in your hearts these holy purposes, unite with me in humble confession and prayer at the throne of His heavenly grace." Then follows the confession to Almighty God.

This seems a strange repetition. First the communicant is asked whether he does sincerely and truly confess his sins. He then answers that he does—this in response to the challenge of the minister. Then he proceeds to do to God what he has already done in response to the minister, viz, makes confession of his sin, not now audibly, but through the words of another. It seems to us that this first challenge of the minister detracts from, if it does not destroy the force of the challenge with

which the penitent must feel himself confronted when he comes to speak directly to the Searcher of hearts. It sounds very much as though in the marriage service a man should be asked, "Do you take this woman to be your lawful wife, &c.," and then should be required, by the repetition of certain words, to do over again what he has just declared he has done. It seems as though there was first a transaction in the heart required, in which true repentance is exercised, and a sense of pardon experienced, and then a public confession made to God, and the comforting assurance given by the minister. This, after all, is separating the inward state and disposition from the real outward act, by which this latter becomes at last only an empty form.

Our objection further to the propounding of these questions is, that they seem to go on the presumption that confession comes only when it is asked for in the way of a catechization. This does not comport with that freedom and willingness with which the penitent comes to confess his sins at a throne of grace.

He is not a stranger there, he is not from a foreign camp, needing to give the countersign in response to a challenge, but he comes as a child, whose sincerity is not to be doubted and casts himself down to pour out his heart directly before God. This he is presumed to be. If he is not sincere—if he would come before God with a false confession, it is not to be supposed that he would do less in response to a challenge from a minister. We know there is precedent for this in the Palatinate liturgy, but we regard it as one of the imperfections of that order of worship which ought not to be retained.

In response to the confession in this preparatory service, what used to be called the absolution in the Palatinate Liturgy, but what is here called a *Declaration of Comfort* is pronounced. It is as follows: \* "Wherefore, dearly beloved, all of you, who

---

\* Compare with this the absolution from the Palatinate Liturgy, which was used for a time in every Lord's-day service.

Unto as many of you, therefore, as abhor themselves and their sins, and trust that, through the merits of Jesus Christ alone, they are all forgiven them, and have re-



with hearty repentance and true faith have turned unto God, may assuredly believe, that He has mercy upon you, and that He will confirm and strengthen you in all goodness, and finally bring you to everlasting life, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

There is here at least an echo, though faint, of the voice of the Church in all ages, as by a priestly act the minister of Christ proclaims forgiveness to the truly penitent, by the authority originally delegated to the ministry by Christ Himself, when He said, "Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted, and whosoever sins ye retain they are retained." If the penitent is told that at the time of his confession, as above, "he may now assuredly believe that God has mercy upon him," then, of course, it is implied that pardon has been conveyed, and conveyed, too, along with, if not in, the declaration of the minister. But there is so little left here, and so studious an effort to keep the office of the minister out of view, that it will hardly be looked upon in the course of time, as anything more than the repetition of certain passages of Scripture in which pardon is promised to the penitent; and when it comes to this, the question will be raised why these may not be read from the pulpit in connection with the sermon, or the address, and so the last trace of the absolution proper will vanish away.

In the Communion Service proper we meet again the bold theory, that the Sacrament is appointed merely to confirm the promise of God for the salvation of men through His Son our Lord. "And the more fully to show forth the promise of the Gospel" (how weak compared with the words, "ye do show forth the Lord's death)," and to seal unto us the remission of our sins, and to assure us of eternal life through Jesus Christ, He hath graciously added to the word of that promise, this blessed sacrament of the crucified body and shed blood of His

---

solved more and more to die unto sin, and to serve the Lord in true holiness and righteousness: to them, because they believe in the Son of the living God, I announce, by the command of God, that they are released in heaven from all their sins, as He has promised in His holy word, through the perfect satisfaction of the most holy passion and death of our Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

dear Son, as the certain sign and covenant pledge of His abounding grace. *Wherefore*, St. Paul, testifying by the Holy Ghost of the true purpose and design of this holy supper, declares (1 Cor. xi.) &c." Here follow the words of St. Paul, where he recites the words of the institution, and warns the Corinthian Christians against eating and drinking unworthily in not discerning the Lord's body. It is difficult to see the force of the *wherefore* in the above passage, for nothing whatever is said previously of eating the crucified body, and drinking the shed blood of Christ.

In the next paragraph the Holy Supper is spoken of as the true *commemoration* of our Lord. This requires that we shall believe that Christ, in the way and manner recited, wrought out our salvation. "We are to remember and believe, that He suffered all this, in order that we might find acceptance with God, and never be forsaken; and that He thus sealed the new and everlasting covenant of grace and reconciliation, with the shedding of His blood, and with His death?"

And now comes the consecration in these words:

"To confirm our faith in this covenant of mercy, *our Lord Jesus Christ, the same night in which He was betrayed, took bread* (here the minister shall take some of the bread in his hand); *and when He had given thanks, He brake it* (here the minister shall break the bread) *and said, Take, eat; this is my body which is broken for you; this do in remembrance of me.*"

Can any one considering rightly the solemnity of the institution of the Holy Supper read these words and fail to experience some indignation at the above interpolation, "To confirm our faith in this covenant of mercy, our Lord, &c."? Who informed these liturgy-makers that our Lord instituted the holy sacrament of His body and blood, *in order to confirm our faith in this covenant of mercy*? And if this is one purpose to be subserved by receiving the holy sacrament, is it the only one? Is it the chief one? and why should it be foisted in just here where we want to hear what our Lord says, and not what men say? Why this zeal for a theory of the sacrament which cannot keep silent at such a moment? We regard it as

exhibiting anything but a spirit of reverence to insert a theory of the Lord's Supper whether it be a right or wrong one, in the fore-front of the solemn words of institution. They are words of deep mystery, felt and acknowledged as such by the Church in all ages, yea so revered even by an inspired apostle that he leaves them alone to speak for themselves. Yet here we have the mystery thrust aside by the remark that this Holy Supper was instituted, and these solemn words said, *to confirm our faith in the covenant of salvation.*

After the consecration there is some advance towards a deeper meaning of the sacrament, where the words of the Catechism are followed.

"As often, therefore, as ye eat this bread, and drink of this cup, ye shall be reminded and assured, as by a certain memorial and pledge of His love and faithfulness to you; and that He feeds and nourishes your souls to everlasting life, with His crucified body and shed blood, as assuredly as ye receive from the hands of the minister, and eat and drink, the bread and cup of the Lord, in remembrance of Him."

We are glad to find in the second form also a better setting forth of the holy mystery, as the following words testify: "Above all, let us have firm faith in the promise which Christ Jesus, who is the everlasting Truth itself, here places before our eyes, *that He will assuredly grant His true body and blood, so that we possess Him entirely and fully, and that He live in us, and we in Him.* And although we see before us only bread and wine, let us not doubt that, by the operation of the Holy Spirit, He accomplishes in our souls, all that He exhibits to us by these visible signs, namely, that He Himself, as the true bread from heaven feeds and nourishes us unto eternal life."

We cannot, however, see the force of the exhortation and caution just before the communion takes place, "And now beloved in the Lord, that we may be fed with the true heavenly bread, Jesus Christ, let us not permit our hearts to cleave unto this visible bread and wine, but lift them up in faith to heaven, where Christ, our Redeemer and Advocate, sitteth, &c."

After our Saviour had consecrated the elements, He said, Take, eat; *this is my body which is broken for you*. This liturgy consecrates the elements, and then says, do not cleave to these, do not regard the sign, but turn away towards Christ at the right hand of God in heaven. If the outward elements are in the way of our spiritual communion with Christ, instead of a help, then why use them at all? Besides, while Christ is at the right hand of God, is He not also present in Holy Communion? and must we in this way separate in our thoughts, what is joined together in the mystery of the Holy Communion?

But we must let this suffice so far as the doctrine underlying the office for the celebration of the Lord's Supper is concerned.

In accordance with the general theory of the sacraments and sacramental acts, confirmation is presented first as an act of the Catechumen, and not of the Church. "To avow the sincerity of their purpose and desire, as well as publicly to profess their faith and assume their obligations as members in full of the Church of Christ; and also to assure us of their purpose to continue steadfast, by the grace of God, in the fellowship of His people against all temptations of the world and Satan, they now present themselves in this solemn manner, before God and this congregation, to the end that they may be publicly admitted into the Church, and entitled to all its privileges." Not a word is here said of confirmation as an act of the Church towards its children, but all of what these persons are going to do in coming to receive confirmation. Referring to their approach to the Holy Communion it is said; "*To increase their confidence* in this invitation, He has been pleased to add to the declarations and promises of His word, the sacrament of His crucified body and shed blood, as visible sign and pledge of His grace to them, and for the confirmation of their faith in Him, and the comfort of their troubled hearts." This is bad English, as any one will find who attempts to analyze it, and it is worse theology. It would seem as though whenever a reference is made to the Lord's Supper, it must be preceded and followed by the explanation that it is only added to the word to increase our

confidence, only a sign of a promise, and scarcely ever a word uttered in regard to the mystery of eating the flesh, and drinking the blood of Christ, which is central in this Sacrament.

An attempt is made to combine with this service for Confirmation the service for Adult Baptism, but it only introduces confusion and contradiction. Any one who will read the question propounded to *all* the catechumens immediately after the baptism of those who require it, has taken place, will see the contradiction. We have seen ministers attempt to combine these two services in using the *Order of Worship*, but it always results in a failure. The two are distinct and separate offices. The baptized and the unbaptized are very different classes in relation to the Church, and this distinction ought not to be ignored in the service for their reception and admission to the Lord's Supper.

The second form for Confirmation is weak in style, somewhat sentimental in spirit, and contains cant phrases. "Beloved in the Lord, we have assembled at this time under truly solemn and interesting circumstances." This opening sentiment asserts a fact, but a sense of the fact is not strengthened by stating it in this style. So the words in the opening of the address to those who have been confirmed: "Dearly beloved, permit me, in conclusion, to add a few words of counsel, in view of your solemn act of consecration to the service of Almighty God," might be omitted (except the first two words) without detracting anything from the strength and force of the address.

The only other service that we shall notice in this particular way is the service for ordination. We are glad to find this elevated and earnest in tone, and with a few drawbacks, asserting the true nature of the office of the Christian ministry.

It sets forth the divine origin of the ministry, and refers in testimony of this to the great Commission, and to the words of St. Paul, Eph. iv. 11, 13. Prof. Good in his Inaugural Address seems to think these words do not refer to the institution of the office of the ministry, but we like the statement of the liturgy

on this point better than his. Indeed the language in regard to the *office* of the ministry and its perpetuation is quite as strong as any one could ask. "*In this way*" (*i. e.* by prayer and the laying on of hands), "*the succession in this office has been perpetuated until the present day.*" The sentence immediately following this is a little slippery. It seems that no sacrament or ordinance can be spoken of anywhere without ringing the changes on the words "sign" and "seal." We quote it: "Nor was the act of ordination by which they were formally set apart to this work, an unmeaning ceremony; but a most solemn transaction, in which those who were thus ordained, received the sign and pledge of acceptance" (only the sign and pledge? and does not the acceptance itself go with the sign and pledge?) "of their self consecration to the service of Christ, the seal of their divine calling" (why not the calling itself?), "and the assurance of the support of the Holy Ghost." Why not the *support itself*?

We have referred to ringing the changes on the words, *sign and seal*. These words are found in the Catechism, and in teaching the doctrine of the sacraments are proper enough in their place. But they are not Scripture terms, and in liturgical forms the Scripture is quite as good authority as the Catechism. So also there is a studious effort, in the services for Baptism and the Lord's Supper, to weave in as much of the language of the Catechism as could be done consistently with the low view underlying these services. But this is no merit. The language of devotion is not just the language of teaching; a liturgy should have a style different from that of a Catechism. This shows, moreover, a slavish and mechanical adherence to the Catechism, and Reformed liturgies too, from which this book is largely compiled. It is not a reproduction, but a compilation. Any one reading it, and tracing the authorities from which much of its language, as well as sentiment, is collected, will feel that there is wanting a moulding power to bring the whole into organic union.

The work as a whole is not homogeneous; for while in some of its services it aims to be a living and real organ for the

worship of the congregation, as in the service for the Lord's Supper, in others it falls back into the character of a mere directory or guide. It does not rise, even in the service for the Holy Communion, to the devotional glow which alone can produce the style of a liturgy, or of worship. This is attributable, no doubt, to the fact, that the Committee felt all the way through, that they were not aiming to produce a form, the highest and best, for the worship of the Church, but only specimens that might serve as guides in doctrine, thought, &c. To produce a living form for the devotion of the Church, requires a special order of talent which only some possess. Such forms are real creations. Of this character are the Psalms, and the devotional forms of the early Church. We say of the early Church, for no one who examines the subject can fail to see that there was there the development of a special genius for this work. This is not saying that other ages may not have as much piety and devotion, but every age has not the same special gifts. Every age does not produce a Shakspeare.

There is no evidence that the Committee that framed this liturgy took any special pains to incorporate the spirit and elements of the primitive liturgies. They give, in a collection by themselves, what they call the *ancient liturgical forms*. There they stand, like the separate leaves of a beautiful flower. The Committee seemed to feel, either that they do not bear on them the impress of the creative genius of the early Church, or else that *they* were not competent to set them in living union with our modern worship. There they stand, unequalled in any productions of later times, yet they are hardly called into use in this book.

But we must bring these remarks to a close. We have set down, in a somewhat desultory way, our impressions, favorable and unfavorable, of the Western Liturgy. We think it ought to undergo a revision, as the Eastern Liturgy did, if it is to live in the Church. It might then become a worthy representative of the theological life it represents. This theological life is, of course, very different from that which the Eastern Order of Worship represents. Both are before the Church, and both are



allowed to be used. We would like to see the Western Liturgy introduced into all our churches which do not use the Order of Worship.

We have happily arrived at such a relative settlement of the liturgical question as will allow the movement to go forward now in an entirely free way. The final issue we may safely commit in the hands of Him who is guiding His Church, in the midst of all her imperfections, in the way of truth and life.

---

ART. VI.—THE PRIESTLY ELEMENT, IN THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.

---

BY REV. GEORGE LEWIS STALEY, PETERSVILLE, MD.

---

“LET a man so account of us, as of the ministers of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God,” (1 Cor. iv. 1). Minister of Christ and steward of the mysteries—such is St. Paul’s definition of the office and functions of the Christian ministry. “Envy, strife and divisions” had arisen among the members of the Church at Corinth, (1 Cor. iii. 3), as in the spirit of party and personal attachment, one said, I am of Paul, and another, I am of Apollos. Indignant at their wicked forgetfulness of a supernatural office and ministry in their partisan preference for one or another of those invested with its authority, the Apostle emphatically demands, “Who then is Paul and who is Apollos, but *ministers by whom* ye believed, even as the Lord gave to every man?” (1 Cor. iii. 5). How forcibly these words set forth the office and functions of the Holy Ministry, as supernatural realities, in the presence and exercise of which, the individual minister, even though it be the great Apostle of the Gentiles, or the eloquent Apollos, sinks out of our sight. The minister of Christ as a dispenser of “the mysteries of God” in his official character represents Christ, and is, at the same time, the organ of his Presence among men, stand-

ing as he does in the bosom, and as an integral part, of that new creation, that mystical constitution of grace that came into historical existence on the day of Pentecost. "A little while and ye shall not see me; and again, a little while and ye shall see me, *because I go to the Father.*" His going to the Father—His entrance into His glory—His residence in the Heavenly World, opened the way for His coming again, ("a little while" after) in that higher and universal form, (as no longer a localized presence as in the days of His flesh), by the power of the Holy Ghost in and by the Church, which is His body, the fullness of Him that filleth all, in all, (Eph. i. 22, 23), thus bringing to pass, as a historical reality in the ongoings of the Christian ages, those words of His uttered just as He was going from them in the triumphal glory of His Ascension, "Lo I am with you always, even unto the end of the world," by which also those other words of His become for us full of significance, as they foreshadow the grandeur and supernatural glory of sacramental ministrations, "Verily, verily I say unto you, He that believeth on me, the works *that I do*, shall He do also, and *greater works than these shall he do, because I go to the Father,*" (John xiv. 12).

The coming of our Lord in the flesh was not a mere temporary theophany, but an incarnation, "once for all"—of perennial force for the ages to come—the same yesterday, to-day and forever—so that His ministry of word and passion and victory—His prophetic, priestly and kingly work are not matters of thought and memory only, but ever present facts—ever-abiding realities in that new world of grace and sacramental mediation, in whose bosom He lives and reigns. When our Lord appointed other seventy also, and sent them two and two before His face into every city and place, whether *He Himself* would come, (St. Luke x. 1, 16), among other things in their ordination charge, He said, "Into whatsoever city ye enter . . . say unto them, *The Kingdom of God is come nigh unto you.*" And again, "Into whatsoever city ye enter, and they receive you not, go your ways out into the streets of the same, and say, even the very dust of your city which

cleaveth to us, we do wipe off against you. Notwithstanding be ye sure of this, that *the Kingdom of God is come nigh unto you.* He that heareth *you*, heareth *me*, and he that despiseth *you* despiseth *me*, and he that despiseth *me*, despiseth Him that sent me."

And then again, we have those wonderful words spoken by our Risen Lord, on the evening of the world's first Easter, "When the doors being shut, where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, *came* Jesus, and stood in the midst of them and saith unto them, Peace be unto you. And when He had so said, He showed unto them His hands and His side. Then were the disciples glad, when they saw the Lord. Then said Jesus to them again, Peace be unto you, *as* my Father hath sent me, *even so* send I you. And when He had said this, He breathed on them and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted, and whosoever sins ye retain they are retained." (St. John xx. 19, 23). And thus commissioned, "*they went forth and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them.*" (St. Mark xvi. 20).

The ministry of the gospel is then not merely a mediatorial continuance of our Lord's prophetic office, but of His priestly and kingly character and work also. The preaching of the word, the ministry of sacrament and worship, the exercise of pastoral oversight and discipline, these three distinct functions constitute the office of the minister of Christ, and must be held and honored as co-ordinate, so that one may not be exercised and elevated at the expense of the others. In the Church of Rome, the whole office of the ministry is absorbed by the Priestly element alone, while comparatively little honor or stress is put upon the exercise of the prophetic function, while in our Protestant Churches generally, the prophetic element of the ministry monopolizes and absorbs into itself all the powers of the great commission, to such an extent, that it will allow no such thing as a Priesthood as part of the same office, essential to its integrity and success.

What we propose to set forth in this paper, is, not that the ministry of the gospel is, in the popular usage of the word, a Priesthood, and that those invested with its powers are Priests, but this,—that, in addition to prophetic and kingly properties and functions, the Holy office involves also, as essential to its integrity and success,

THE PRIESTLY ELEMENT AND FUNCTIONS.

It is generally taken for granted, by those who deny that there is anything like a priestly quality in the Christian ministry, that the universal priesthood of believers vacates the necessity for any priestly ministration,—whereas, this very fact requires the existence of a special priesthood as its organ in the worship of the congregation and the offering of its spiritual sacrifices. Those words of St. Peter, (1 Pet. ii. 5, 9), in which Christians are styled “an holy priesthood, a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation,” etc., are fully paralleled by these words of the Lord, when He called unto Moses out of the mountain and commanded him, among other things, to say to the children of Israel, “Now, therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a *peculiar treasure* unto me above all people . . . and ye shall be unto me a *Kingdom of priests and an holy nation*,” (Ex. xix. 5). And yet the priesthood, as a distinct office, filled by men whom God called to do service in the Tabernacle, and stand before the congregation to minister unto them, (Num. xvi. 9), with Altar and sacrifice, constitutes the very heart, and core of the theocratic dispensation. For, as we read, “When Korah, Dathan and Abiram, with two hundred and fifty princes of the assembly, famous in the congregation men of renown, gathered themselves against Moses and Aaron and said, Ye take too much upon you, seeing all the congregation are holy, every one of them, and the Lord is among them. Wherefore, then lift ye up yourselves above the congregation of the Lord,” their sin was, that they claimed for themselves the special functions of the priesthood also, (Num. vi. 10), on the ground that they, (the people), were a kingdom of priests. The enormity of their guilt in thus ignoring and set-

ting at defiance a divine order of grace is witnessed by the terrible judgment visited upon them, when "the earth opened her mouth and swallowed them up, . . . and there came out a fire from the Lord and consumed the two hundred and fifty *men that offered incense.*" (Num. xvi.) Surely in the light of this pertinent history, we may conclude, that a general priestly quality as attaching to "a peculiar people," does not render unnecessary a special priestly office and ministration, but, on the other hand, that these "examples and shadows of better things to come in the new world of grace, bear eloquent and emphatic testimony, that the Royal Priesthood" of the people makes necessary an order of ministers to stand at the altar, and "accomplish the service of God." It *must* indeed be true here, as in all orders of existence, whether in the sphere of nature or of human life, that what is general, (belonging to the genus) and universal, must find expression in particular and individual organizations.

There is, however, vastly more in the priestly office and functions of the ministry than can be claimed for the priesthood of Christians in general. If the minister on the one hand, is the organ and mouth-piece of the people in the service and worship of the Sanctuary, he is, on the other the organ and representative of Christ, in his character of "steward of the mysteries of God." In virtue of the priestly property of his office, he stands between God and the people, offering their gifts and sacrifices, while, at the same time, through his ministrations, grace and benediction are bestowed upon the faithful worshiper. The fundamental conception of the priestly office is that of mediation, not of any self-constituted sort, but because "every priest taken from among men—called of God as was Aaron—is ordained for men in things pertaining to God," that he may, in accordance with a universal Divine Law, (the law of mediation), become the organ of communication between Heaven and Earth—between a sinful race and a Holy God. Being of this two-fold character, its ministry is equally concerned with what God does towards us, and with what we do towards God, in the way of service and sacrifice.

In the Old Testament order, the Priest stood, as all acquainted with its liturgical ritual must admit, as a real mediator, through whom alone it was lawful for the people to approach unto God, and by whom God dispensed the blessings of the covenant; this, however, not in any absolute sense, but only as prophetic, of that better order of things to come in after ages in the person of Jesus Christ, the great Apostle and *High Priest* of our profession. *He* is the absolute mediator, both as regards His person and work. He mediates God to man, not only as a mode of revelation (in His prophetic office) as regards the existence and counsel of God, but as an actual coming of God into the order of our life, "to seek and save the lost." He mediates man towards God by bringing such a sacrifice—even his own Divine Human Person in vicarious offering—as God will accept, and which is made once for all after the power of an endless life. Having passed into the heavens a high-priest forever, after the order of Melchisedek, His sacrificial work stands forever—of force always to put away sin—needing no other sacrifice or priestly ministrations to supplement its consummate fullness and perfection. There must needs be, however, as in the case of the truth that came by Jesus Christ, which requires a ministerial office to proclaim and teach it, a ministerial priesthood to make available to us in the way of personal application and appropriation, the grace brought near to us by Him who, as the Lamb of God, taketh away the sin of the world. The true character of the Ministry in this regard must be obvious at once from the simple reading of the words already quoted. "Peace be unto you, as my Father hath sent me, *even so* send I you; and when He had said this, He breathed on them, and saith unto them, whose-soever sins ye remit, they are remitted, and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained." If *He* was sent by the Father, not merely as Prophet and King, but also in this central office of Priest, then it follows from these words, that His Ministers, in some sense, partake of His priestly office and functions, as being part and parcel of that mediatorial constitution, which He has established in the Church, which is His Body.

The preaching of the gospel, as is generally admitted, does not exhaust the significance of the Ministerial Office, nor call into play all the powers with which it is clothed. The kingly office looks back to another office and function, through the exercise of which, as a precedent condition, room is made for pastoral oversight and government. This is unquestionably the priestly quality or property of the office, to which the preaching of the Gospel brings men, who ask, what shall we do? that they may be baptized into Christ for the remission of their sins and the gift of a new, spiritual life, and afterwards be renewed more and more after the image of this same glorious Christ by feeding in a mystery—the mystery of the Altar—upon the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood of our Lord.

It is obvious, certainly, that these functions are not essential to the preacher's office—that while they are superadded to it, they are yet in no sense necessary to the mere preaching of the truth. If, indeed, the Christian Redemption were only that scheme of humanitarian improvement, which finds its spring in mental and ethical considerations—in the contemplation of the true, the beautiful and the good—then indeed would the preaching of the Gospel include in itself the whole power and significance of the office. But when our Lord commissioned His Apostles, sending them, *as* the Father sent Him, He not only commanded them to preach, but also to *baptize* in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost, those who, under the influence of their preaching, desired to become His disciples and thus participate in His redemptive work. Evidently their preaching was designed to open the way for the ministry of baptism, and towards this, as the essential significance of their vocation, they always exercised their prophetic authority—that thus those, who were moved to obey the call of the Master, might receive that grace, for the communication of which this Holy Sacrament was ordained,—viz. union with Christ, and participation in the virtue of His death and in the power of His Resurrection.

St. John, the Baptist—that stern preacher of righteousness—the last of the Old Testament prophets and of a priestly



family also—in whose person was the “contact of the ages” and who stood on the verge of the Kingdom of Heaven—prefigured this conjoining of the priestly to the prophetic work, when he baptized the multitudes, who submitted to his teaching, in the waters of the river Jordan. The Prophet of the Old Testament was not, however, necessarily a priest. The offices, though sometimes united in the same person, were, for the most part, separate and distinct. The kingly and priestly—the kingly and prophetic—the prophetic and priestly, were occasionally found conjoined in one person; but it was reserved as the distinguishing and crowning glory of our Lord, as *the Christ* that He should *be* in His peculiar character, as mediator, and exercise in their absolute fullness the functions of, “Prophet, Priest and King of Humanity.” The convergent lines of Old Testament prefigurations all centre in Christ—ancient prophet, priest and king as antitypes finding their end and meaning in His person, and the higher Dispensation, He came to bring in.

If now, in the sacerdotal ministries of this ancient order of God's grace, we find functions corresponding with and foreshadowing those other offices of the Christian Ministry, which are no proper part of the *preacher's* work, considered in itself, we are surely entitled to conclude, that these are the real and substantial acts of priestly ministry and mediation, of which *they* were types and shadows. To one at all familiar with Tabernacle and Temple service, the Brazen Laver standing between the Altar of burnt offering, and the tent of the congregation with its significant washings and sprinklings, oft repeated, is suggestive of the grand reality brought to pass in the Laver of Regeneration and the Baptismal Washing away of sins, the Priest, in his place at the Altar, receiving the sacrifice and dispensing it again to be consumed by the worshiper—the offering of incense as symbolical of common worship—possible and acceptable only by and through the sacrifice of the altar,—and the concluding Benediction, as sealing the peace of forgiveness and acceptance, constitute in sum

the work of priestly intervention, in the Old Testament order, ordained as the shadow and prophecy of better things to come.

Now there are in the office of Minister of Christ, besides the duty of preaching the Gospel, other functions and duties, corresponding as type and antitype, with the sacerdotal ministrations of the Levitical Priesthood, viz. the ministry of baptism—the offering of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and the distribution of the consecrated elements—the ministry of common worship and Benediction—as the glorious realities of that higher development of God's Kingdom, into which the old order has been merged.

As we have already said, the prophetic office opens the way for the exercise of the priestly ministry, first of all in the Sacramental Washing of Holy Baptism. The preaching of St. Peter on the Day of Pentecost constrained the assembled thousands to ask, what they must do? to whom the reply was given: “Repent, *and be baptized* every one of you, in the name of the Lord Jesus, *and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.*” Here, beyond question, the Sacrament of Baptism is presented as such an act of mediation and intervention, as belongs to the priestly idea, and as constituting the only point at which the penitent believer could be brought into communion with the blood of the Lamb sacrificed for the sins of the world. If indeed the administration of this service is only an extension of the preacher's office, setting forth, as it were, transactionally, what at other times is expressed in ordinary language, then indeed is the doctrine of Baptism as held and taught by Apostles and apostolic men, utterly without sense or meaning; for everywhere, in the Scriptures and in the writings of Holy Men of old, is this Sacrament associated with the fact (not the mere probability of it,) of a birth into a higher life—a cleansing from our ancient stains and a planting into the death of Christ that we may walk in newness of life. It is impossible indeed, if we carefully collate and conscientiously interpret the teachings of our Lord and His Apostles, to come to any other conclusion, than that the Minister of Christ, when dispensing the “mysteries of God,” as he stands at the *Holy Laver* is perform-

ing an act of priestly intervention of the highest order, through which only men are brought near to God.

While the Altar, standing before the door of the Tabernacle with its sacrificial offering, as a "*conditio sine qua non*," signifies making possible and opening the way for our washing in the Laver of Regeneration, it is taught, by necessary implication, that it is only after our being washed, that we can approach the altar and offer our sacrifice, and participate in the sacrificial repast on and after the sacrifice. As in the Old Testament order, the Priest received the sacrifice and offered it upon the Brazen Altar, and then dispensed portions of it to the worshipers to be eaten with Divine Benediction, so the minister of Christ receives the offerings of bread and wine, placing them upon the Altar, with words of prayer consecrating them, that they may, with true effect, represent the Body and Blood of our Lord—becoming indeed after the manner of sacraments the Body and Blood of Christ, and thus, a true memorial sacrifice—He dispenses them again to be consumed as the true meat and drink of our souls, whereby, only we can be saved from death and raised to immortality at the last day. "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you. And whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed." (St. John vi.) Here again we are confronted with the fact of a true priestly mediation, as something vastly different from the mere proclamation of the gospel in the use of significant symbols and which every earnest worshiper feels, in his inmost soul, is not simply transactional, or symbolical preaching, but a real communion between heaven and earth, in and through which we are fed and nourished unto everlasting life.

And then, too, we have, as in full correspondence with the Altar of Incense, the ministration of Common Worship, revolving around this central service and worship of the Beloved, whose name is a pure and holy incense, through which all our worship may go up before our Father, a sacrifice accept-

able, well pleasing to God." When with his face towards the Altar, as the Representative and mouthpiece of his brethren, he gathers up in one common form, the confessions, prayers and praises of his brethren, laying them on the Altar of the gospel in conjunction with the great sacrifice, he is acting for men in things pertaining to God, as a true mediator in that mediatorial order, which springs from the Person of our Lord. But when, with face turned, as it were from the Altar towards the waiting congregation, he utters words of blessing, then again as a true mediator he is acting for *God* in things pertaining to men, actually bestowing benediction—a peace that passeth all understanding—in God's name.

This blessing the people in God's name, is for those who have faith in the Church as an order of grace, and in the ministry as a sacramental institute, not an unmeaning ceremony, or a merely decorous way of dismissing a congregation of Christian people; but a real priestly act, by which God bestows upon devout, waiting souls, grace and strength and peace—as the culmination indeed of their whole worship. Such truly, it is always felt to be by those, who believe in the Church, as the Body of Christ, where He continually lives and reigns. What a burlesque, indeed, has the utterance of words of Benediction become in many quarters, where the whole meaning of it seems to be regarded as no more than a simple intimation, that the service is now over and the people are at liberty to retire—a burlesque in full harmony with that caricature of the Doxology (which is properly the closing Jubiletic shout of our offerings of praise) we so often witness, when the congregation is instructed to sing the last verse of the final hymn, standing as though it were only the first orderly step in their going from the church.

Rationalistic Evangelicalism, whose entire business it seems to be to degrade the Church and ministry to the level of mere humanitarianism, may sneer and satirize, but the implicit faith of the humble Christian recognizes these acts of priestly intervention, as real points of communion between God and man, through which come grace and Benediction.

Equally true is it also of the various ministerial acts in which words of blessing are pronounced—in confirmation—in marriage and in the burial of our departed brethren in the Lord, that we have the power and effect of true priestly mediation and intervention by a *ministerial* priesthood through which Christ Himself communicates His grace and blessing.

In these and other forms, we have exhibited the presence of a quality in the Christian ministry which fully corresponds with its ancient prefigurations in the Levitical priesthood, and of which it is obviously the object or business to *minister* Christ in the actual application of the benefits of His death and Resurrection, in a sense which cannot be predicated of the office of preaching considered simply in its own proper character. If then, there be in the Christian ministry this priestly element and these several priestly functions, it must needs follow that

#### THERE IS A CHRISTIAN ALTAR.

And so, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, with great emphasis, declares that "We have an Altar (Heb. xiii. 10) of which they have no right to eat, who serve the Tabernacle," fully setting forth, that there is in the Christian economy, the reality which the old Jewish Altar and its service only faintly typified and foreshadowed. In that elementary order of God's grace, the Altar of sacrifice, as God's institute, was the point at which God met the worshiper and bestowed gracious benedictions; and so it came to pass that wherever they might be—no matter how distant the land of sojourn or captivity, the Jews would pray towards the place where God was wont to manifest His presence. The full glory of this Altar presence was reserved, however, for the Christian Dispensation.

The Holy of Holies, into which the High Priest entered once a year, is no longer a veiled sanctuary, but the Divine has entered into the Human in such sense, that He who was born of the Virgin is our Emanuel—God with us. Our humanity in Him has entered into the Holiest of all, and the middle wall of partition is forever broken down. In His character as the great sacrifice, He is Himself (absolutely) Priest, Victim,

and Altar. The whole idea of Old Testament Sacrifice is fulfilled in Him who is the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world. It must needs be, therefore, that in our worship and service, these several factors find expression, if we would, with true effect, lay hold of and appropriate the sacrifice made once, but of force always.

There seems to be—there is indeed, a demand in our universal human life for a visible altar in some form, upon which to offer our sacrifices, and at which we may come into real communion with the Divine in the way of worship. Indeed, so universal is this association of the Altar with any worship, that the cases where no altar exists, are indeed the exceptions to the general rule; leading to the inevitable conclusion, that a phenomenon so wide-spread and of such venerable age, that the memory of man runneth not back to the time when it was otherwise, owes its origin and existence equally to a primitive Revelation and real human want.

The former of these two factors is indeed the legitimate response to the latter, and the assertion may be safely hazarded, that only where there is and has been a total absence of all faith in a coming of the Supernatural into the sphere of the natural, and consequently only a deistic faith, in an abstract, speculative Divine Existence, do we find what passes for religion, and religious worship, characterized by a total absence of altar and altar service. Among all the peoples of ancient and modern times, where there is and has been this faith in Divine Revelation, as a real coming of the Divine into the sphere of our human life, whether as one or many incarnations—in monotheistic and polytheistic religions alike—there we are everywhere confronted with Altar, Priest and Sacrifice, as central and essential features in their religious ceremonial. Manifold and monstrous, indeed, are the perversions of this primitive institute (of unquestionable, divine origin,) in the idolatries of the ancient and modern world, but none the less, perhaps all the more, for this very reason—significant and prophetic intimations of that true Order of Worship, brought to pass through the coming of our Lord Jesus in the flesh.

There is no need, that we should set forth in great array the facts bearing upon this point, as they confront us in the old theocratic order of God's grace, as the prominence of the Altar is such that it appears at once to the most superficial observer, as the living, beating heart, from which issues the very life blood that vitalizes their whole religious life. Strike out the altar with its continual ministrations of sacrifice, and all that is distinctive in the Jewish religion is stricken out at the same time. Priest, altar and sacrifice are, in their unity, a symbol and prophecy of "some better thing to be provided for us, that they without us should not be made perfect."

This "better thing" provided for us is *not a destroying but a fulfilling rather of that old prophetic and disciplinary order*—not an abrogation, but a carrying forward to its realization in history, of what till the coming of our Lord, was, in some sense, only shadowy and unreal. The glorious realities in the Person and passion of Christ were the patterns—the heavenly things themselves, after which, as types and examples these rudimentary institutions were fashioned, so that, in the new and higher dispensation of fulfillment we must have Priest, Altar and Sacrifice, not in a lower or less real, but in a higher and truer sense, than in the perversions of heathenism, or the elementary institutes of Judaism. As already stated, Christ is in Himself absolutely and once for all, High Priest, Altar and Sacrifice, and having entered into the Holiest Place, the significance and virtue of His Person and work must be exhibited to and continually confront us in that Divine Organism which is His Body, not merely in their essential oneness, but as well also, in their necessary diversity, that we may be enabled to appropriate in faith and adoring worship, the great salvation of the gospel.

The pulpit, as we have already said, in its functions, looks towards the altar and its ministries, as the point of union and communion of the natural with the supernatural. Indeed just as we come to any proper sense of the priestly element as an essential and integrant part of the office of *Minister of Christ*, will we be impressed with a sense of the necessity of an altar as the place of priestly ministration; for *ministering* Christ, is not



simply preaching Him, but an actual applying of His benefits to penitent and faithful souls. As Christ's minister, then, he must *not* only represent Him ministerially, but must represent Him sacramentally also as the crucified One, in sacrifice, which necessitates the symbolism of a visible altar, upon which we offer to God and plead in our behalf, the merits of His most precious passion and death, and when by the real consecration, which comes upon them, in the blessing and dispensation of the sacred symbols, which our Lord calls His body and blood, then the altar becomes, as it were, a holy place, and in some sense also, the point in which the sanctity of our Churches centre, the holiest of all and the very dwelling-place of the Shekinah. What less can it be indeed for one who believes, that our Lord Himself is the celebrant in the Divine office, offering Himself to the Father in sacrifice, and His flesh and blood to us as true meat and drink whereby only we can participate in His merits and be raised up to immortality at the last day?

Let it be said, that this is superstition, or mysticism, or popery, or any other of the many bad things, which the Rationalism of the present day is in the habit of fastening, as terms of reproach, upon whatever is distasteful to its superficial thinking, the Christian Altar is notwithstanding, *ALL THIS*, for the faith, (implicitly) of every earnest disciple of our Lord. Why then the outcry against looking towards the altar in our acts of worship, when at that point is performed the central service and from it are dispensed the mysteries of God in sacramental ministrations; and where, in a special manner the supernatural world reaches down and over into this natural order, and Jesus Himself, as on the night of the Institution blesses Bread and Wine, manifesting Himself there as He does not to the unbelieving world? Rather how improper and unbecoming, to use the mildest terms, it is, to turn the back deliberately as upon the Divine Presence, and the face towards the door, as looking to the lower humanitarian level of the outside world, that denies that Jesus Christ had come in the flesh.

It was not idolatry in the ancient Jew, to open his window,

and worship toward the temple and the altar—particularly at the time of the morning and evening sacrifice. Rather was it divinely enjoined. In the consecration prayer of Solomon's temple, the thought continually recurs, "If they shall pray *towards this place*—recognizing my Presence—then hear Thou and answer." This turning towards temple and altar was the outward practical acknowledgment, (not merely in thought) of God, as He had revealed Himself in their dispensation and history, and challenged their faith and obedience, as the children of the covenant. As compared with the religion of nature, their's was a supernatural religion, faith in and submission to which, constituted them, Israelites indeed and in truth.

And so must it be in all Religions—and pre-eminently so in the Christian Religion. The Altar, in its true symbolism, as linked to what is objective in the world of grace, presents continually and challenges our submission to, the central mystery of the gospel, that the Word was made flesh as the great fact of all history; and that this Divine-Human Person was offered in sacrifice for the sins of the world, and His flesh and blood are now offered to us, as the antidote of death and the pabulum of our spiritual life. In this view, it is obvious, that when, in our prayers and thanksgivings, we kneel towards the Altar, as the place of a Divine Presence, we only recognize and acknowledge the fundamental mystery of our faith, *Christ crucified*, as our only hope of salvation.

There remains yet to be considered, as necessary to complete this discussion,

#### THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE.

The existence of priest and altar necessitates a sacrifice of some sort, for the offering of which they have been ordained. Without this, priest and altar are only unmeaning names, of no practical value whatever. Where the preacher's office absorbs into itself the whole business of the sanctuary, the priestly quality of the Christian ministry and the altar are entirely ignored, or if the names are still retained, they are employed in a strained, metaphorical sense, and for the uses of transactional and symbolical preaching.

"Behold the fire and the wood," said Isaac, to his priestly father, as they neared the appointed place, "but where is the lamb for a burnt offering?" "*God will provide Himself a lamb for a burnt offering,*" was the reply. The instincts of our common religious life, in the sphere of nature, demand as complementary to priest and altar the offering of some suitable sacrifice. To say nothing of what meets us in the manifold religions of the world, we find that the covenant, as it started in rudimentary form in the person and family of Abraham, and expanded into full organization in the Jewish Theocracy, revolved and centred in the *sacrifice* laid upon the altar by the priest. And when at length the fullness of time had come God provided a Lamb—the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world—to be a sacrifice once for all, not as concluded and past, but of force always in the ages to come, after the power of an endless life.

And just here we feel the profound significance and pertinent application of those words in our Lord's great sermon, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; for I am not come to *destroy*, but to *fulfill*." Christianity, therefore, in its cultus, has the substance of the things hoped for—the abiding realities—"the good things to come," of which the law had only the shadow.

Surely there cannot be less—there must be infinitely more, of what constitutes sacrificial worship in the "better covenant," that has taken the place of that old covenant, which was only "the example and shadow of the heavenly things," after which as the patterns, Moses was admonished of God that he should make all things pertaining to the Tabernacle and its worship. The patterns of the heavenly things cannot contain or signify more than the realities they shadow forth; and, therefore, it follows that, as we have a great *High Priest* that is passed into the heavens, carrying forward His priestly mediation in our behalf—presenting and pleading His sacrificial merits before the throne, those who as His chosen subordinates exercise a ministerial priesthood must needs also have somewhat to place, and plead upon their altars in the *outer court* of that "true Tabernacle which the Lord hath pitched, and not man."

For us, as for God's people in patriarchal and theocratic dispensations, there is but one way of approach to God, and that lies through sacrifice. "*I am the Way*"—the priestly and mediatorial in this passage standing out with marked prominence as compared with the prophetic (the Truth) and kingly (the Life). "No man cometh unto the Father but *by Me*." All our worship and service, therefore, find acceptance and benediction only in conjunction with the ONE SACRIFICE MADE FOREVER, which "as a pure and holy incense—as the odor of a sweet smell goes up before God, acceptable and well pleasing to Him." We are impelled, indeed, by the deepest instincts of the Christian consciousness, to place ourselves and our service upon the altar of the Gospel, in union with its glorious sacrifice, and, therefore, in all our prayers and thanksgivings we return habitually to this central act in our worship, as we conclude our devotions with the words, in, or through, or for the sake of the passion and death of Jesus Christ our Lord. It is this habitual reference and return to the name of Christ that gives sacrificial character to all our acts of worship—linking them to the memorial sacrifice transacted upon the Christian altar in the communion of the Body and Blood of our Lord and Saviour.

And here we are confronted with the central significance of the Lord's Supper, as being in itself the sum and substance of all Christian worship—preëminently *the Liturgy*—vitalizing and rendering acceptable all other forms of worship. The bread and wine, as natural elements, received as an offering from the hands of the people by the minister and placed upon the altar, in the use of the words of institution and by the powerful benediction of the Holy Ghost, having become, after a heavenly and sacramental manner, the Body and Blood of Christ, are offered as a MEMORIAL SACRIFICE before the throne of our Father in heaven. It is then and there that the supernatural—that heavenly order—that true spiritual world in which Christ, now risen from the dead, continually lives and reigns, comes to actual union with the natural world in such form that we are said to taste of the powers of the world to

come. The words, "Do this in remembrance of Me," as uttered by our Lord at the time of the Institution, and in the midst of His sacrificial work, could surely mean no less than that the bread which He calls "My Body," and the cup which He calls "My Blood" should in all coming time, as the memorial sacrifice, perpetuate and make available by the vivific agency of the Holy Ghost the merits of His most blessed passion and death, as of perennial—ever present force and freshness for the rolling ages. And so St. Paul evidently means the same thing when he declares that "as oft as ye eat of this bread and drink of this cup, ye do show forth the Lord's death until He come." Clearly the apostle did not intend, in the use of these words, any showing forth of the death of Christ in the way of symbol and transaction, to the outside heathen world; for, in addition to the fact that there is no special or very striking significance in the use of a little bread and wine to teach the world the lesson of our Lord's death (a crucifix would answer the ends of symbolical preaching far better), the profane and unbelieving in the primitive ages were not permitted to witness these holy mysteries. Fairly interpreted they set forth this precious truth, that in the Lord's Supper we are permitted in a very special way to show forth and plead the merits of our Lord's sacrifice before our Father in heaven, as the ground of our acceptance and justification. This "mystical exhibition of His one offering of Himself, but of force always to put away sin," which we make in the use of the consecrated bread and wine, presenting them upon the altar of the Gospel, is the reality of all prophetic and typical sacrifices—the very heart and core of all Christian worship.

There is yet another consideration, which, as corresponding with the typical sacrifices of the Old Testament economy, serves to set forth clearly the sacrificial character of the Lord's Supper. It is this: The priest having received the offering and presented it upon the altar before the Lord, as a sacrifice, returned it in part, with Divine benediction, to be used as a feast upon and after the sacrifice. The same feature is clearly seen in

the original Paschal Sacrifice and Feast, when the Lamb having been slain and the blood sprinkled sacrificially according to the Divine command, was used as the material of a feast, preparatory to the pilgrimage upon which the Israelites were about to enter.

Christ our Passover has been slain for us—therefore we keep the Feast of the Holy Communion, receiving from the hands of the minister, and eating and drinking the consecrated symbols, as the true meat and drink whereby our souls are fed, nourished and made strong for the pilgrimage and conflicts of this life, and grow meet and ripe gradually, for life everlasting.

This side of the Lord's Supper, as a Sacrificial Feast, is clearly set forth in the Heidelberg Catechism (75, 76, 79 Questions), which teaches thus; that He feeds (in the Supper), and nourishes my soul to everlasting life with *His Crucified Body and shed Blood*, as assuredly as I receive from the hands of the minister, and taste with my mouth, the bread and the cup of the Lord, as certain signs of the Body and Blood of Christ." It teaches further that to eat the Crucified Body and drink the shed Blood of Christ is "*not only* to embrace with a believing heart all the sufferings and death of Christ, . . . but also *besides that*, to become more and more united to this sacred Body . . . so that we, although Christ is in Heaven and we on earth, are notwithstanding, flesh of His flesh, and bone of His bone, and that we live and are governed forever by one Spirit, as members of the same body are by one soul." And this, because we are all partakers of that one Bread, which came down from Heaven to give Life to the world.

Taking, therefore, these two sides or elements of the Eucharist, as they are foreshadowed in the Old Testament sacrifices, and remembering the words of our Lord, "I came not to destroy, but to fulfill," and, calling to mind all the circumstances of the Institution, we are surely entitled to conclude and hold as the central mystery of our worship, in full accord with the faith of the Christian ages, as enshrined in all liturgies entitled to the name, that the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ, is a true *sacrificial offering of the consecrated Bread and Wine*,

in memorial of the Great Sacrifice made once for all; and a feast also upon the sacrificial elements, with Divine Benediction, after the sacrifice.

If there be, therefore, this priestly quality in the office of the Christian ministry, charged with the performance of these sacerdotal functions, in its stewardship of the *mysteries* of God, then, very evidently, the Christian Life, as regards its generation and development, involves agencies and powers, beyond what is implied in the mere preaching of the Gospel. When our Lord was about to leave the world, "He spoke unto His Disciples saying, All power is given to me in Heaven and in earth. Go ye, *therefore*, and teach (literally, make disciples of) all nations, *baptizing* them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to *observe* all things, whatsoever, I have commanded you, and lo! I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen." (St. Matt. xxviii. 18, 19, 20.)

This Discipleing of all nations consisted essentially, as regarded its beginning, in the baptism of such as were brought to an "acknowledgment of the mystery," and as regarded its after progress, in the observance of those things, which He had commanded (Do this in, etc.,) as these sacramental ministries and observances, were backed by His perpetual, personal presence in the Church as His Body. Thus, and only thus, would the virtue resident in Him, go out in streams of blessing to the nations. Not by the preaching of the Gospel, by and of itself, but by sacramental energy and power are we born again (*from above*) and nourished unto everlasting life. To these as the centralities of the Christian Religion, the preaching of the Gospel to the nations, ever looks forward, John the Baptist-like, as the end of its ministry; and towards which also, it ever looks back, Paul-like, as the ground of all its instructions, admonitions, warnings and rebukes, to those who stand "in the fellowship of the mystery" as members of the Catholic Communion of the saints and citizens of the Heavenly State.

We conclude this discussion with these three practical lessons:

1st. A proper conception and corresponding honoring of



this element of the Christian ministry will re-adjust the prevailing Protestant distortion of the relation between the Pulpit and Altar. The preacher will no longer be the prominent figure and actor, in the services of the Sanctuary, and the sermon will no longer virtually absorb and monopolize, as now, the almost entire interest of the congregation. People will cease to speak of going "to preaching," and learn more and more, as they wait in the Courts of Zion to

Prize her heavenly ways,  
Her sweet Communion, solemn vows,  
Her hymns of love and praise.

The individual minister, as a "steward of the mysteries of God," though it be a Paul, or an Apollos, or a Cephas, will sink out of sight in the dignity and glory of his office; and we shall hear no more of personal dislike to the Pastor because he has not the gift of popular eloquence. Excellency of speech or of wisdom will no longer be regarded as essential qualifications for the pastoral office, and Christians, everywhere, will learn to honor the man for the sake of his office, and not the office for the sake of the man.

And as regards the minister himself, there will come with a proper conception of this priestly quality of his office, an irresistible impulse to be true, simply, to his character as an under-shepherd, whose sole business it is, to restore the souls of men, leading them to the still waters and into the green pastures, that they may eat of Heavenly Bread and drink of that living water, of which if a man drink, he shall never thirst again, because it shall be in him, a well of water springing up into everlasting life. His ministry of the word and his ministry of discipline, will look forward and backward to his ministry of Holy Sacraments—claiming nothing for himself, and attributing whatever success he may achieve to Him, whose minister he is. And as intimately connected with this,

2d. The Altar will become central—the point towards which our thoughts and affections gravitate as the most sacred spot on earth; for there it is, the Great Sacrifice, the Lamb

Slain, "is exhibited and represented with true effect as of ever abiding force—the same yesterday, to-day and forever. In the sacramental mystery transacted there, we have set forth not only the Death of Christ, in the memorial sacrifice, but also from the offerings of Bread and Wine—lifted by the act of consecration above the dominion of the curse, into the higher region of the supernatural,—we are nourished unto everlasting life."

When once we come to have faith in this mystery of an Altar Presence, we can no longer find full satisfaction in the mere hearing of the word, but we poise and centre our very souls, in restful worship upon the Person of our dear Lord and Saviour.

In these circumstances, the words of St. Peter as they express the inmost contents of the Christian consciousness, when confronted with the presence of this mystery of godliness, sound like the echo of our own thoughts and feelings. "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life, and we believe and are sure, that Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," (St. John vi. 68-69.)

Prayer, Praise, Communion and Benediction, are all linked with this Altar Presence; and even the preaching of the word becomes, in some sort liturgical, finding ready response to its lesson from Gospel and Epistle, as part and parcel of the organism of Altar Worship, in the minds and hearts of all earnest worshipers. And finally:

3d. Faith in this priestly and sacrificial element of the Christian ministry and the Christian Religion will beget and enlarge the spirit of sacrifice, as an element in the universal priesthood of believers. Just in proportion, as our worship is truly liturgical and sacrificial—ruled and intoned, as it were, throughout by the priestly quality—will men be brought, more and more, to offer and present unto God, in union with this glorious mystery of the Altar, "the reasonable sacrifice of their persons; consecrating themselves, on the Altar of the Gospel, in body and soul, property and life, to His most blessed service and praise."

The spirit of Christ is the spirit of sacrifice, and the more intimately we come into Communion with Him, and feel the power of His life, the more readily and promptly will we deny ourselves, and take up the Cross allotted to us to bear, and follow the Master, even though it were to Crucifixion with Him.

The religious intellectualism of the day, due doubtless to the overwhelming influence of the prophetic quality of the ministerial office, cannot be otherwise than unfavorable to the spirit of devotion, and is to a large extent chargeable with the falling away of the Christian world from the self-sacrificing charity and almsgiving of the early Church. How indeed can it be otherwise, when the preaching of the Gospel is so sundered from its proper relations, and made to stand out in such undue proportion to the other worship and service, that it degenerates for the most part, into an intellectual and literary exercise for the entertainment of the people. Only when there is a full and hearty return to the old habit of sacrificial worship, will the springs of self-sacrificing charity be again fully opened—from whence streams of blessing shall issue in overflowing fullness to make glad the City and Heritage of our God. Then, and not until that time, will Christians appear as a “chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a *peculiar people*,” showing forth, by their works of love and charity, “the praises of Him who hath called us out of darkness into His marvellous light.”

## ART. VII.—THE INFANCY OF CHRIST.

---

FROM DR. HARBAUGH'S LECTURES ON DOGMATICS—THE SYMBOLISM OF CHRIST'S INFANCY.

---

As Christ was the "Son of Man" as well as the "Son of God," He was, in a certain sense, the product of humanity as well as of divinity. Humanity and the history of the world travailed with Him—His coming or birth was prepared in the womb of human history as well as in the womb of the Virgin.

In all great events there is a kind of concentration of powers to bring them forth, and as these energies centre in one point, they are in all other points correspondingly abstracted or withdrawn. The event of the birth of Christ was such a time of concentration. The energies of humanity, and of human history were concentrating towards His birth. The better life of humanity was gathering up into the more direct line of Christ's ancestry.

Four centuries before His birth, Judaism had uttered its last public testimony in the prophetic voice of Malachi; the former direct communication with God in the nation seemed to cease; and instead of an extensive, there began an intensive movement in the life of Judaism. Times, history, the energies of humanity began to gather towards a "fulness." Humanity's womb was drawing all the world's energies towards itself for the birth of a new æon—or the principle of it—namely, the divine-human life of the Son of God and of Man.

These mysterious operations of humanity's life, like the first energies of all life, were hidden and secret (Ps. cxxxix. 15). The ancestry of Christ glided back into obscurity, and were no longer prominent in the world's outward history; so that when the mystery was ripe for consummation, it found the Lord's handmaiden of "low estate" (Luke ii. 48). The "mighty" had been "put down from their seats" by a withdrawal of the divine forces, which had kept them up, and God was exalting "them of low degree" (Luke ii. 52). In the lowly family of

despised Nazareth, and obscure Bethlehem, the energies of history and humanity had concentrated. Here was the great womb of the world which was to conceive and give birth to the great mystery. Here the best life of humanity, and all the pre-working life of the world, had concentrated for a re-heading and a new birth.

Whenever a new light is kindled, the old darkness passes closely around the new light-centre. Whenever life is to break, germ-like, out of the seed, the old form, though breaking and doomed to pass away, still adheres closely to the centre of the new life; so at this great new birth of humanity, the old forms of the world's life appear close around—appear in their worst and most effete character. The very chrysalid of Judaism, under which the new life had ripened, hugs that life as it is struggling forth to manifestation and victory. As in every great event in history, so in the birth of Christ, that which is to come, and that which is to be overcome, are brought together in close contact and conflict.

Hence as before His birth, in the pure and sinless development of His divine-human life in the womb of the Virgin, the pure and normal had to perfect itself by maintaining a conflict against the impure and abnormal: so after His birth the same abnormal world was present on all sides challenging to a new and wider conflict.

All this is represented, and we must believe *symbolized*, by the circumstances of His birth and infancy. We contemplate the scene as a picture; the divine-human infant is the bright object, and the world as there concentrated is the dark background. Near Him is light. Closely around Him there is a bosom of love, a friendly presence. The mother's love,—the family circle though small, the greeting angels; later the visiting shepherds, the homage of the Magi, as the representatives of the longings of heathenism; the devout and hoping Simeon, and Anna; these turn a bright and cheering face toward Him, like clouds that gather radiantly around the rising sun. In these we see the best in the world concentrated around Him at His birth. These are prophetic of what is to be when

the circle shall widen around Him. These constitute a small bright nimbus at the spot where heaven touches earth. These are signs of life where the true life of humanity begins.

But the dark background, the old worn-out world, the effete forms of humanity are also there. That the world is adverse to Him is also symbolized. The manger, the rude stable, form a surrounding of indignity. The night and the winter speak of the darkness and coldness of the world. In the Inn the world is gathered and represented, forming its centre, and carrying on its traffic near Him, at once the cause and evidence of His neglect. There is the world's shrine of tribute near Him, to whom all homage is due. Later, the aversion and wrath of the world against Him is gathered up in Herod; and the babes slaughtered on His account, are the tender first fruits of a future "noble army of martyrs." In His forced flight into Egypt, the world for a time utterly prevails against Him.

Moreover the moral and spiritual state of Judaism is such as to show a withdrawal of life. Phariseeism was but a shell—a lifeless chrysalid. Sadduceeism had skeptically ignored the true life of Judaism. Esseneism was a morbid surrender of the great hope of Israel, a separatistic giving up of the true meaning of Judaism—a bartering of the concrete reality of redemption for an abstract and unsubstantial mysticism, seeking to escape from the world in itself, instead of seeking victory over the world in the Messiah. Beyond these effete organized forms of degenerated Judaism, there was yet the floating individualism represented by the publicans—individuals of strong religious instincts, but desperate in their hopelessness, giving themselves up to unrestrained sin.

All these symbolic facts and events are *great words of the Word*. They are true and everlasting gospel. Truly and forcibly has one of the Fathers said: "Every act in the history of the eternal Word Incarnate is itself word and doctrine."

The process of the new against the old, the new in the old, the new out of the old and over it, as we have seen it in His coming out of the bosom of the effete Judaistic world, as we

have seen it in His own person victorious in the womb of the Virgin, and as we have seen it now also in that world in which His infancy is found,—this process continued and still continues. It is the process of the new birth and renovation of humanity. It is the process of the pure in the impure—of life over death. It is the process resulting from the reheading of humanity in the new Adam. It is the process which works towards the “gathering together in one all things in Christ” (Eph. i. 10); so that as from the womb of the Virgin was born the natural holy human body of Christ, so from the womb of the world and humanity shall be born the perfected mystical body of Christ—the Church.

#### THE INFANT PERSONAL WORD.

There is a strong tendency in modern theological thinking, first to separate the *work* of the God-man from His *person*, and then to base the work of redemption rather on His work than on His person, and then also, consequently, to make more account of His work than of His person. There is a similar disposition to separate His word from His life, and attribute to it a kind of autonomic power apart from His life,—forgetting that He is Himself the *Logos*, the Word—that His person and life are word—that even in His boy-hood He was “filled with wisdom”—that in Him “are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge” (Col. ii. 3). He did not merely *teach* the word of God. He *was* the word of God. “In Him was life, and the life was the light of men.” Where there is only the natural human life, as in Heathenism, there is not the truth. It is the all-covering fact, that in His person the divine and human, finite and infinite, spiritual and natural, are united, that forms the principle of all truth. His person is the genuine truth, because it is the generic life. In His life only is the principle of revelation, and its absolute consummation,—a revelation not only *to* man, but *in* man. “The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us” (John i. 14). The disciples did not merely hear the word which He spake, but St. John says, “We have seen with our eyes, we have looked upon, and our hands have handled of the Word of life” (1 John i. 1).



From these tendencies to exalt His spoken word at the expense of the personal Word, and to separate His word from His life, has resulted the habit of making little account of His holy infancy—of regarding it as a blank in His saving life, or at best as only a common necessity which requires that He should pass through the stage of infancy, in order to reach manhood, and thus reach the beginning of His redeeming work.

He was the Word as a child, as well as He was when later He spake and taught. In His birth the Word was manifested. The infant that lay in the arms of His Virgin mother, was, and is, and will be for the Church as truly a Great Word, a glorious Gospel, a mighty and saving dogma, as any word that ever fell from His anointed lips. "*Verè verbum hoc est abbreviatum!*" The Word in the manger has been, is, and ever shall be a true and mighty saving power in the world. It is the Word of all words,—the Doctrine of all doctrines, the Truth of all truth, the Life of all life.

There is no difference between the Life and the Word in the divine human person of Christ.\* When He assumed our nature, His life introduced into our nature the true principle of salvation. Our salvation truly began in the "Holy Child Jesus." All that He afterwards did and spake was substantially only a continuance of His life in humanity—a carrying forward of His incarnation to its completion. Thus the saving, atoning virtue of His person covers His infancy as well as any other portion of His life. He is the Saviour, not on the Cross merely, but also in the manger. If the Cross is a symbol of salvation, so is the manger. If Calvary is a shrine, so is Bethlehem. If the event of Good Friday is a glorious gospel, so is the event of Christmas.

This view of the deep and important meaning of Christ's infancy seems to have been clearly perceived already by *Irenæus*, who had listened to Polycarp, the disciple of St. John. He laid great stress, in his Christology, on the idea that Christ

---

\* The word, truth, is not full truth as long as it is *abstract*; it must become *concrete*. As *abstract* it only reaches the mind,—it must reach the spirit, the life, the intuitive nature of man. It must be a *fact*,—not a thought.

re-headed, recapitulated, humanity. He labored to show that, as it was necessary to redemption, that he should by a truly human birth become truly the new Adam, the real new head of humanity, and that as by that means His divine-human life secured a truly saving beginning in humanity,—so the saving power had its perennial and perpetual base in His person. “As His birth was the *repetition* of human birth in general, so it was necessary that His life should *repeat* human life in general” (Duncker, p. 222). “Just as Christ by the assumption of our flesh in His birth became human as we are, so must He in His life, in which He became in all points like us, *become what we are*, in order that we, through the real communion into which He has taken us up with Himself, may become what He is” (Duncker, p. 222).

Therefore Irenæus brings out strongly, and lays great stress upon, the fact that Christ’s life passed through every age or period of our human life, in order thus to sanctify and glorify all, in these several ages or stages of life; and to do this not by His word merely, but by His life.

“He re-headed our whole humanity in Himself, from the beginning to the end. . . . . For how can we be made partakers of the adoption of sons, unless through a son we have received from Him that communion with Him which makes us really sons; wherefore He passed, in His own life, through every stage of human life, restoring to all that communion which we should have with God. . . . . He did not set aside or pass beyond the human, nor annul the law of the human race in Himself, but He took up into Himself, and sanctified every age of human life through which He passed, through that likeness which it bore to Himself. For He came to save all—all, I say, who through Him are born again into God—infants, children, boys, youths, and men. Therefore, He passed through every age, and was made an infant for infants, sanctifying infants; and a child for children, sanctifying those being of this age, and at the same time being an example to them of the efficacy of piety, and of righteousness, and of subjection. He was made a youth for youths, being an example to the

youths and sanctifying them to the Lord. And in like manner He became a man for men, that He might be a perfect leader for all, *not only* in the way of setting forth the *truth*, but in the way of *actual being*, sanctifying, at the same time, the men, and being also an example to them."

In all this it is easy to see, that Irenæus ascribes to the human life of Christ a perpetual, sacramental and saving power in all its stages and acts. The virtue which, from His holy humanity, touches human life in all its circumstances and stages, is not the virtue merely of *truth* or of *example*, but the virtue of His holy and sanctifying life. His infancy, childhood, boyhood, youth, and manhood, were *grace* and *life*, which may be perennially claimed by these classes and ages of human life; so that they may plead not merely the merits of His sufferings and death in their behalf, but also the merits of His holy nativity, infancy, childhood, boyhood, youth, and manhood. It is at once plain that this is the very thought of the catechism.

In like manner did the Church take up and embody this idea in its LITANIES. Here they plead for deliverance and mercy: "By the mystery of His Holy Incarnation; by His holy nativity and circumcision," as well as by the later facts of His suffering, death, resurrection and ascension.

In like calm consciousness of this deep truth does the Heidelberg Catechism find the base of salvation back in the holy conception and birth of Christ. "What benefit dost thou receive from the holy conception and birth of Christ?" It does not answer this question by the shallow conception, that it was necessary for Jesus to be born in order that He might become our Mediator by afterwards teaching and suffering, but rather with the deepest insight into the profound sense and substance of the gospel, it fears not to reply: "That He is our Mediator, and with His innocence and perfect holiness, covers in the sight of God, my sin, in which I was conceived."

Here we are taught that not merely His suffering and death, but also His innocence and perfect holiness, cover sin; and especially that His holy conception and birth cover the sin of our unholy conception and birth. A thought as profound as it

is beautiful, and as true as it is beautiful and profound. His Incarnation, taken as a whole, including every stage of His life, was the absolute sacrament of life and the absolute life of sacraments. Wherever He touched our fallen nature—and He touched it at all points—He touched it as the virtue and power of life, atonement, and salvation.

Every act and fact of His life, as set forth in the Creed to be believed in, is a real victory and saving virtue for us in the same stage, circumstance, and degree of our own life. His sufferings are a power for us and in us—His death is the death of our death—His burial and repose in the grave is a real sanctification of the grave of every saint—His resurrection and ascension are a power drawing us upwards by virtue of a real fellowship; but so also in like manner are His conception, birth, and infancy a real power for that stage and degree of human life. Just as our death and rest in the grave could not be what they are if Christ had not shared in them, and passed through them, so infancy could not be what it is if Christ had not passed through the state and stage of infancy.

#### THE POWER OF THE PROMISED INFANT WORD IN JUDAISM.

We have seen that there lies a deep meaning and a mysterious power in our Saviour's infancy. Every stage and fact of His life has a vital and necessary connection with the salvation of the world.

This power of His infant life was ever felt retrospectively in Judaism before His actual Incarnation. It did not come in abruptly and unpremeditated.

Judaism expected the Messiah to appear as an infant. He was promised to them as "the seed of woman." As Eve, at the birth of her first child, expressed a hope that she had begotten the Messiah (Gen. iv. 1), so the prophet, as the organ of the Jewish mind and heart, ages later responded in the spirit of the same hope: "Unto us a child is born," &c. Is. ix. 6, 7.

The same hope continued to be familiarly cherished by the pious to the time of our Saviour's birth. There is no surprise at His appearing as a babe. No incongruity is seen or felt in

the prophetic picture of a babe with its heel upon the head of the fearful serpent. It is the very symbol under which the spirit of Judaism recognized the great Deliverer. The angel, the shepherds, the devout Simeons and Annas, and the Magi, were all prepared to see the manifestation of the Divine Redeemer in the form of a child. They did not expect Him to come after the manner of fabled Minerva, in full adult form, power and perfection.

How natural is this mystery! How true to human life is the Incarnation! Its being so true to the order of human life is the only "sign" given. "Ye shall see the babe wrapped in swaddling clothes lying in a manger" (Luke ii. 12).

The idea thus existing in the Jewish mind through all the ages prior to the actual incarnation, exerted a powerful influence on the Jewish parental heart, on Jewish family life, and on Jewish childhood.

To see the force of this truth, we need only contrast the parental feeling and family life, as it has been and is in the pagan world, with what we find it to be in Judaism. In paganism, family life is purely in the sphere of nature. Nothing rises above selfish, and earthly ends. "Without natural affection" (Rom. i. 26, 27, 31). Women and infants command little respect. How different is all this in Judaism!

A little careful observation of the Old Testament economy will show us several ways, in which God, in direct connection with the promise and hope of the coming of the LORD, sought indirectly and directly to cultivate, elevate, and sanctify the natural parental instincts and affections. He lodged into Judaism fundamentally, certain central, ruling, generic elements, which wrought deeply, quietly, and powerfully toward this result; and the hope of Him, who should be born as the "holy child," was the life of it all.

1. We can easily see how the settled conviction—a conviction resting on a direct promise—that Christ should be born of a woman, tended to put honor and elevation upon the female sex. Just in proportion as men believed this promise, and were invariably and truly affected by it, would they look with

reverence and respect upon women. In so far as they were deeply earnest in their faith and hope, every woman was in their eye the probable mother of the Messiah.

2. In the same way would this hope of the Messiah cultivate a strong family interest and feeling. Any family might be the one out of which Christ would come. This made care for the honor of the family strong, and zeal for the family name a prominent feature in Jewish social life. This would naturally call forth every energy for the elevation and purity of the family. Though only one family could obtain the prize, that very fact made the boon more precious, and increased the stimulus of this holy ambition (1 Cor. ix. 24). Hence genealogies were so carefully preserved.

3. It was their hope of the birth of the promised child, that elevated their views and feelings in regard to the marriage relation, which is the very foundation of the family and of family life. The seed of the woman must come from holy families. Hence marriages out of the covenant were forbidden. The sacred generations were guarded against admixtures with the uncovenanted (Gen. xxiv. ; also xxvii. 46). When the issue is heir to a throne, the blood is carefully guarded. This accounts for the awful horror with which the law regarded bastardy (Deut. xxxii. 2) and adultery (Lev. xx. 10).

4. This hope of the Messiah powerfully awakened the love to children. The love of offspring was a predominant feature in the Jewish character. To be childless was regarded as the greatest of all curses (Lev. xx. 20, 1 Sam. xv. 33, Jer. xxii. 30). It was to be lonely and desolate. The family did not bloom. To be childless was to have no voices of joy to cheer the solitude of the tent, no promise to cheer the hopeless future. Hence this was made the subject of special promises on God's part to His faithful people (Deut. vii. 14, Ps. cxiii. 9, Is. liv. 1, Ps. cxxxviii. 3, 4).

Whence was this joy in children, so unlike what is found to be the general spirit of heathenism? It was the promise of the "Seed of the Woman." This cultivated high hopes in connection with their offspring. Their daughters might be the mother

of the promised child; their sons might be the child Himself. Thus the ideal infant Jesus was the tutelary divinity of the Old Testament families. As the beautiful unseen, the life of His powerful ideal presence was the elevating vigor in the parental love. Thus He was sanctifying families before he became the actual light and holiness of that of Joseph and Mary. Thus was His power present in Old Testament marriages before He sanctified the marriage joy by His first miracle in Cana of Galilee. Thus did He in reality bless little children, before He took them into his arms to bless them in the days of His flesh.

Not merely did types, shadows, laws, and prophetic words in the Old Testament set forth Christ and testify of Him, but far deeper and more powerfully than these did His ideal person there operate—it wrought itself into the very life of Judaism, and dwelt in hearts and families; yea sounded, as it were, in the songs of joyous childhood, and flowed as life in flesh and blood from generation to generation.

#### POWER OF THE MANIFESTED INFANT WORD.

We have seen how the ideal infant Jesus, as He was expected to appear in the Jewish families, wonderfully elevated and sanctified parental affections, the family relations, and the state of childhood in general.

Since His actual birth the real infant Jesus, in a still more deep and powerful manner continues to move, elevate, and strengthen these affections in the bosom of the Christian family. The Jewish ideal Infant Saviour has become the Christian real model infant Saviour.

The general feeling as it reigns throughout Christendom, that the infant Jesus is the model infant, has its best expression in the fact, that it has been embodied in immortal works of art, by painters, sculptors, and poets. On canvas, in the purest marble, and in living verse, as the achievements of the highest genius and art, has and does the whole Christian world behold with great joy, the reflection of its own conceptions—the embodiment of its own feelings.



The Madonnas—the picture of the model mother and the model child—have been the admiration of the learned and the unlearned, the high and the low, the rich and the poor in all ages. Why? Because the master artists have in them, given local habitation and tangible expression to what has been and is the general feeling and sense of the Christian mind—have located that image of beauty and perfection, which has in all Christian ages hovered before the devout mind. These embodiments of art did not create this universal Christian sentiment; they only interpret it more clearly than each one could do for himself.

These master-pieces of art, answering thus to universal ideas and feelings, show what a powerful and wide influence the model Infant has exerted upon family life and love. This influence it is difficult to define and fully portray, because it is so mild and silent. It cometh not, like some other powers, by observation, neither can we say of it always, Lo here or lo there. But this to a thoughtful mind only proves it to be more deep, real, and far reaching.

We readily acknowledge the power of Christ's general life in the way of model. No one doubts that He, as the "Pattern Man," is silently exerting a moulding influence on man even beyond the direct power of His teachings. Not merely the words which fell from His lips, and are now on record (in part at least) move and mould the mind of the world, but He Himself as the great, personal, eternal, incarnate Word, He is the embodied, ever-living truth, and life and love. His glorious, divine-human person radiates a transforming power. Every stage of His life, as we have seen, is perennial; and thus does His Infancy, as one lovely period of His life, ever send out a power to mould parental love, to sanctify family life, and to bless the world of childhood.

We may see the deep significance and power of our Saviour's Infancy in this view, when we call to mind the fact, that, in every respect, agreeably to a well-known and acknowledged law of human life, we are moulded by that which has been before us and is now around us. Especially are we always

strongly influenced by models. As in nature, the object which we behold is reproduced in an exact image of itself in our eye, so do the models which we constantly and fondly admire silently reproduce themselves in us. There is no power in the world like that of models. They stand out in every department of art, science, social life, and religion, like suns that shine down on and illuminate all beneath, and reflect their own image with more or less perfection in every surface of life that is turned toward them. Every one who has discovered—and who has not?—that there is a perfection above what he has yet reached or realized, is silently and perhaps even unconsciously, but yet surely, laboring up toward it. This is ever before his mind as the end to which every stage of progress is constantly referred. It is on this same principle and ground, that works of true genius are of such immense value to the world. Those who overlook this law in our nature, or who know it not, are sometimes found to disapprove of the expenditure of vast sums on works of art, such as painting, sculpture, monuments, and churches. They forget that these model elevations silently draw all beneath up toward themselves.

This principle comes to view in our Saviour's act, when Judas complained of the waste, and when Mary poured the precious ointment on the feet of Christ. It was a model act of self-sacrificing love. As such it has accomplished a thousand-fold more good than could ever have been done by the three hundred pence given to the poor.

These remarks serve to show the power of models. In the light of this principle must we judge of the mysterious meaning of our Saviour's Infancy, as it relates to the development and perfecting of the parental feeling. This model, spontaneously and without an effort, is constantly in the Christian parental eye and mind. In this model the Christian mother loves her own infant. Her spirit filled out with this image prays over her child, and her eye lit up by a great hope thus inspired, educates its opening powers, while her maternal nature is educated at the same time by a holy reflex influence.

The power of this model is heightened by the circumstance,

that the infant Jesus, though strictly human, is truly, and this consciously to the parental heart, more than a human infant. The eternal God in miniature; "the eternal Word of the Father shortened to the dimensions of an infant" (Jeremy Taylor, Vol. I. p. 36). It is the Divine infant as well as the human.

"In the babe that lies in smiling infancy," is seen that gracious power of life and love, to which the parental heart feels that infants may be committed as unto a faithful Saviour. This Infant not only inspires love, but more than love—reverence; a feeling which sees in the object something greater than in itself. Reverence for an Infant! This is a mystery. "Most interesting," says Coleridge, "it is to consider the effect, when the feelings are wrought above the natural pitch by the belief of something mysterious, while all the images are purely natural. There it is that religion and poetry strike deepest." This very feeling is awakened in the parental heart by the divine-human Infant. From it goes forth a natural, which is at the same time supernatural, influence, under the mysterious power of which the bud of human life in the maternal lap may unfold into pious adult life, and ultimately into the holiness and joys of the saints in heaven. The devout and reverential contemplation of the Infant Saviour sheds this light of hope over the cradle. The Christian mother "feels it in her joy," and hence her meditation and prayers over it, ever alternate between her own and the model Infant. Thus does love to the human infant grow in the power of love to the Divine, and the lower is ever taken up and sanctified in the higher. The Saviour and the saved blend and are united not only in her vision, but in the very life of her faith, hope, and love.

These mysterious alternations of the parental heart between its offspring and the model Babe Divine is beautifully brought out in that true classic, "Watts' Cradle Hymn." How the parental heart hangs, now on the one, now on the other! The mother makes, in truth, the Holy Infant Jesus the nurse of her own. By hymning the story of that Babe, which was the Prince and the true power of Peace, she hushes her own to

peaceful rest. This hymn need only be carefully studied to enable us to see how, throughout the whole of it, the divine and human life blend, and how, in the sixth stanza, she turns by way of interlude to her own babe; and then so naturally turns also to the story of the Holy Child. The devout humming of that hymn over the cradle is more than a prayer—it is the utterance of the sense of a divine-human presence—it is the reproduction and the power of the great saving fact of God incarnate in infant form for mother and for child. He who once stilled the tempest on the dark-rolling Galilee, with less majesty, but with equal love, here whispers over the restless infant, "Peace, be still!" It feels His power of peace in the devout mother's lulling voice and sinks to rest.

The surrounding imagery, which presses into the picture with the Infant Jesus, gives to this Model additional power and attraction, especially in the hearts and homes of the humble poor.

We have seen, that the coming and the presence of the new divine-human life creates, or gives character to the surroundings. The life coming to manifestation creates the attendant events, so that these are really and truly a part of the manifestation. So the rising sun makes the gilded clouds around him, and his setting makes the clouds dark and sombre. Any powerful personality that rises in the history of the world is, not only a present power to the class whom he directly benefits and raises, but remains a perpetual power to the same state and condition of human life. By a like law does the God-man become an abiding power and life for the states of human life which it first touched. As truly as He is a life for humanity as a whole, so truly is He to all its states and conditions. And He touches the needy states, because the need and the help necessarily come together. In the light of this principle must we now further set forth other rich powers of the incarnate Word, as embodied in the imagery surrounding His birth and infancy.

We see not in the picture of the Infant Saviour's birth the back-ground of a chamber in the home of the rich. No glit-

tering, gilded chandelier to illumine the apartment ; no marble busts of an earth-honored ancestry in niches looking out ; no soft-figured matting upon the floor ; no richly flowing purple curtains hanging in heavy folds around a downy couch ; nothing of the kind. But we see a stable. Above and around are naked walls or rough-hewn timbers. Racks for beasts we see ; the mute staring ox and ass standing back astonished, yield the empty manger to the wonderful child. There are open crevices, through which are heard the rude murmurs and the boisterous, idle life of the tax-payers, borne from the crowded inn on the chilly, mournful night-wind. For—

“ It was the winter wild  
While the heaven-born child  
All meanly wrapped in the rude manger lies ;  
Nature, in awe of Him,  
Had doffed her gaudy trim,  
With the great Master so to sympathize :  
It was no season then for her  
To wanton with the sun, her lusty paramour.”

Such are the features of stern and humble poverty, which stand in the picture with the birth of the Model Infant. Similar scenes of chilling poverty surround the advent of thousands of infants in the huts of the lowly, pious poor. But here, as a power, is the fact of the Divine Infant's humble advent known. Here does the light of parental love, which illumined and made warm the stable of Bethlehem, also shine. Here is sorely-pinching poverty cheered by the presence of Him, who sanctified that state, and those circumstances, by passing through them Himself. How many an humble Christian cot has thus been blest by Him who for our sakes became poor (2 Cor. viii. 9),—blest by the remembered fact of the poverty which surrounded our Saviour's infancy. In no chamber of the rich has faith ever been in a position where it could feel Him to be so truly near (Taylor, vol. 1, § iv. p. 35).

Thus our Saviour's infancy gives a true value to infant life in the humblest circumstances of human life and society. Thus it cheers, elevates, and sanctifies parental affection. No such power

ever moved the parental feeling in paganism. In Judaism, though there was an approach to it, yet it fell short of it as shadow does of substance, as hope does of fruition. In the hearts of the Jewish parents there was, it is true, the hope that their offspring *might be*, either the Messiah or His mother; yet as ages rolled solemnly and slowly away, and thousands were born, in whom they did not find the "Babe Divine," that high feeling became only a general power. There was only one chance among an almost infinite number to keep hope alive. Christian parents, however, are sure that every infant born to them may become a child of Christ, a Christian, a member of Christ, an heir with Him forever to imperishable honor and glory. It may be a star in His crown, as it is now a lamb in the arms of the Church.

With a great hope does such a fact fill a parent's heart. It plants this high conception of infant worth and destiny in the bosom of every Christian family. It teaches the parent ever to associate the present honor and future glory of the child with that of the Divine Child. It gives assurance that every human infant is capable of being partaker of the divine nature. The divine in the human ever raises the conception to the human in the divine.

The same mysterious power of the Model Infant, which thus silently and deeply affects the parental feeling, begins also very early to reach the heart and mind of infancy in general.

Almost the first thing which affects and moulds the child in Christian families, beyond the influence of the parents' face, features, acts, and tones, the first certainly which ought to meet its opening powers, is the story of the infant Jesus. As the infant John the Baptist leaped at the salutation of the Virgin, then already the honored depository of the incarnate mystery, so does infancy joy at the first presentation of the Holy Child, whose name and power are "Wonderful" (Is. ix. 6). The human infant not merely loves, it reverences the divine-human Infant; yet as the divine is also so truly human, its reverence does not overpower, but it elevates and intensifies its love. Its love becomes moral and spiritual in the very fact, that its instincts

of love are, as it were, unconsciously conscious of the divine and holy in the divine-human Child. The human familiarizes it with the divine. The picture of the Holy Infant in the manger, and on the Virgins' knee, mingles in its play with dolls, and is the first which it seeks in the picture book.

No other stage or period of the Saviour's life is so near to the child. The crucifixion startles, if it does not horrify it. This tragic scene presupposes and requires a knowledge of fearful elements in human nature, with which the child is not yet familiar, and with which it can have no sympathy. To it, it is only a wonder! That scene is a picture, for a later period of life. It will receive the fact, and gaze at it in silent wonder; but the sympathies of its nature at that period of life will find nothing congenial in it. It is not so with the Holy Infant in the manger. That scene and fact belongs to its own stage of life, and to it its heart responds with a deep and mysterious sympathy.

It at once loves this infant Saviour, believes in Him with that peculiar unconscious faith which precedes knowledge, and is therefore implicit, pure, and true. It loves and believes in Him by mysterious spiritual instinct, as it loves and believes in its own mother's bosom, eyes, and tones; and feels that He is just as necessary to its happy being as those are. The image, and the mighty idea with it are securely nestled in its heart to remain there as the complement of its life. This image and impression will be there firmly fixed for later life to protest against all motions to sin, or suggestions to unbelief. This holy image will move before it as its "life star." The memory of it will be the fragrance of its earliest, latest, and best feelings. It will abide as the mystic shrine of every child-like feeling to which the man will ever love to return as to the purest and best state this side of heaven. To the end of life, and in all heavy hours,

*"Pictured in memory's mellowing glass,"*

will manhood behold, with deep emotion and ever fresh comfort, the Infant Jesus whom he learned to love in His earliest life.

Can it be imagined for a moment, that the spirits of little children could be moulded into such a sacred and lasting bias



towards piety, if Christ were not known as an infant—if the mysterious power of His infancy were not in the world? Could a purely adult Saviour reign with the same effect and sway over infant life? Who, after deep and serious reflection, will say this? It is against all the philosophy of human life. It would be the same as to present to an infant an adult image, instead of a miniature doll, to please it in its play. The law of the infant mind must be respected and kept in view—it cannot be set aside. He who, in becoming incarnate, has condescended to our infirmities by taking on Him our infirmities and sorrows, from the same necessity of adaptation, became an infant for infants, that He might truly be their Model and High-priest, becoming in all points like as they are, except sin.

We say the law of the infant mind cannot be ignored. Do we not naturally and always arrest the pleasant attention of children, and interest them most successfully by objects in miniature?—little books, little cottages, little horses and wagons, little watches, little dolls for the play-house, and little dishes for their table? This fact rests on and reveals a deep law of human nature in its infantile stage. It reveals the deepest philosophy—a philosophy which, if we will be earnestly thoughtful, will furnish us the true key to the mysterious meaning and power of our Saviour's infancy. Hence it is, that children are instructed and moulded, not so much by words, as by this Model Infant. They are under the tuition, not of the written word, but of the Incarnate Word—and this Word abbreviated—in miniature—the divine-human Infant Saviour.

Thus that Holy Child, the seed of the woman, is properly symbolized as a hero, an infant Hero, with His heel upon the serpent's head. A Hero! but how unlike those who are so regarded in the eyes of the world! A Hero, who conquers meekly and silently—who does not cry, nor lift up His voice in the street. A Hero, who subdues without a sword—who aims first, not at capitals and walled cities, but at parental and infant hearts. A Hero, whose advance to the conquest of the world is from infancy to youth, from individuals to families,

then communities, nations, empires, and at last over the whole world, by the exercise of a power silent as leaven,—subduing all to Himself by silent constraint, by the charm of His condescending mercy, making the conquered to love Him, and filling their hearts with songs of gratitude and praise to the gentle power that hath won, and winning blest them.

In this way does the Word truly become flesh—that is really enter into and unite with human life. He does not merely become flesh, and human, in that He takes human form, but more especially in that His life really enters human life, and becomes the basis and momentum of its history. He does not merely lodge His truth into *minds*, but into our nature and life, in such a way as to take hold of its deeper elements, so as to apprehend it before mind is developed. This life becomes perpetually and perennially the light of men. In this way does the eternal Word enter the life of the race. Thus the life of the personal Word touches human life before the spoken or written word lays hold of the human mind. What He was and is, is ever nearer the race than what He speaks and teaches.

---

#### ART. VIII.—RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

ADDRESS DELIVERED AT HIS INAUGURATION, as *Professor of Dogmatic and Practical Theology in the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church, Tiffin, Ohio; July 1st, 1870, by Jeremiah H. Good, D.D., Cincinnati: Elm Street Printing Company, 176 and 178 Elm Street, 1870.*

THERE is much in this Inaugural Address which we can heartily endorse. In certain portions it presents what we regard the true nature both of Christianity and the Christian ministry. Take for instance the following: "But not merely as a factor in the natural order of the world, highly important even under that view, but as an *order of men* whose office it is to challenge the generations constantly coming and going, with the supernatural order of life embraced in Christianity, does the Church concern herself with the education and proper training in every way, of a *Christian Ministry*. For Christianity is not only a very important fact, but the highest fact that can claim the attention of men; and all other advances and acquirements, in any sphere of life, are of little value, unless

crowned by the spiritual right relation of man to God; unless sanctified and irradiated by undying life in Christ the Redeemer of the world."

Again, take the following: "Answering now to this need from the side of man, we have from the side of God the *instituting of the Christian Ministry*. It is not a mere profession, by the side of other professions; not a mere order of men set apart to charm the ear, or the understanding, or the fancy, by elegant lectures on interesting topics, that shall give all, both old and young, a taste for nobler things than the pursuit of wealth and honor or pleasure, as the main end of life. It is really an order of men, instituted of God, called of Christ, fitted out with proper gifts (*χάρισμα*) by the Holy Spirit, designed to be in perpetual succession, in God's own way, until all the nations of the world shall not only have come to the light of God's revelation, but shall have been renewed and sanctified in Christ Jesus our Lord." So what is said of the Sacraments in certain places we can endorse: "They are always mentioned as standing in most intimate and living connection with the new birth of man, and his growth in the new life. No wonder that . . . they should be everywhere set forth as *central points and central acts* of the new covenant, &c."

But then it is very evident, that there is another theory of Christianity and of the Christian ministry than the above would seem to indicate, running through the address. Its view of Christianity is, that it is a work finished and done, outside of human history, and that this work is now to be brought to the knowledge of men in the way of preaching, and if upon its being presented they believe, God makes over to them certain benefits. Thus, although one of the quotations given declares, that the sacraments stand in most intimate and living connection with the new birth, in another place the way men *become* Christians is pointed out without any reference to a sacrament at all. Let us quote:

"This now involves the necessity of the constant presence of the Christian ministry; and this in a double respect:

"First, As a fallen creature, this redemption objectively accomplished and at hand, must be announced to him (Rom. x. 14, 15). The great truly comforting fact (Heidelberg Catechism, Question 1), that really and objectively his guilt has been atoned for, by the spotless Lamb of God, must be proclaimed to him; must be pressed home to his knowledge and to his conscience, in such a manner as to develop in him the consciousness, that he is in a state of guilt and misery, in such a manner as to lead to repentance and faith, to a change of heart and disposition, and to a faith not merely in the doctrines of religion, but to a personal faith in Jesus Christ, the Redeemer, and thus to prepare him for, and to fulfill all the conditions required of God, so that Christ may be implanted in him, and he become a new creature, which in its unfolding may reach the divine idea of man.

"And, *Secondly*, as a renewed, regenerated creature, as one in whom Christ has been born through His Spirit from above, as one on his pilgrim's way Zionward, the very posture in which he stands, and the very constitution of his nature, require the constant help and aid of the ministry of the Word and Sacraments, that the new life may be nourished and may grow, that the old man may constantly be more and more overcome, until the perfect man in Christ Jesus be reached" (Eph. iv. 11-13).

The reader will notice how studiously all mention of any sacrament is avoided in the first paragraph, which refers to the new birth, or beginning of the Christian life, notwithstanding in one of the other paragraphs quoted it is said, that *in the Scripture* the Sacraments are always mentioned as standing in most intimate and living connection with the new birth of man and his growth in the new life. Dr. Good, in the above language, seems to find place for them only in the nourishing of the new life.

It will be noticed also, that he interprets the first question of the Heidelberg Catechism as referring to the comfort which comes from the fact, that redemption has been objectively accomplished, or that his (the Catechumen's) guilt has been really and objectively atoned for,—that this fact must be pressed upon him until there is developed a consciousness that he is in a state of guilt and misery, in such manner as to lead him to repentance and faith, to a change of heart, &c., &c. We would like to ask Dr. Good whether there is any "intimate and living" connection between the baptism of the catechumen and the comfort here brought home to him? And if so, why in a paragraph which reads like a legal document, evidently intended to be precise and full, he omits all reference to this sacrament?

His view of redemption does not seem to take in the fact, that although it was actually and really accomplished, *once for all*, the "once for all" here does not mean, that it is a fact passed away, but ever living and working in our race—that it is of perpetual force. In this view we cannot think of it as a mere fact to be taken in by the intellect, and through this, even under the power of the Holy Spirit, working man's regeneration. Christianity is, as the address elsewhere says, *an order of life*, and it cannot reach us in its essential character through the intellect so as to bring us really into its own order. This can be done only by the sacrament. "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."

Of course it must be first preached to the world as a fact—men must be prepared to accept it—but its entrance into us in its essential life-character, is through that sacrament to which St. Peter called the multitude on the day of Pentecost. Hence we cannot agree with the address when it regards the Sacraments as addressing themselves to man in the same way the preaching of the word does,—as teaching by signs what preaching teaches by language.

This is about the poorest and lowest view of the sacraments that can be conceived of.

Of course with such a view of Christianity and the Sacraments, it would follow, that the great work of the minister is to preach the Word, and the administering of the Sacraments would be resolved into this. Hence the minister would have a prophetic office, and as exercising rule in the Church, a kingly office, but no priestly office.

This is one of the points which the address makes conspicuous. *A Minister is not a priest.* Well, if we regard the perversion rather than the right use of the office, we might say, *a minister is not a king*; for he is commanded not to lord it over God's heritage, nor to be called master. Yet who can deny that the minister, in union with the elders, exercises ruling functions in the name of Christ, and that in this sense the kingly power of Christ is perpetuated in him?

The quotations and references in the address refer to the priestly office in such false sense. For instance, the Second Helvetic Confession, Cap. 19, is quoted to prove, that "in the new covenant of Christ there is no longer any *such* priesthood, as was in the Ancient Church of the Jews," a proposition which all Christian people will adopt. The Christian ministry is not a Jewish priesthood, nor yet a priesthood in the Roman Catholic sense, but it does not follow from this that it possesses *no* priestly functions. What functions is the minister exercising when he is administering the holy Sacraments, or offering up the sacrifice of thanksgiving and praise? Surely not the prophetic, for he is not teaching; not the kingly, for he is not ruling. It can be none other than the priestly function. It may be said he is exercising the office of *ministering*; but this term designates the general work of the ministry, and cannot designate a particular function of the office.

There are other contradictions in the address. In a paragraph already quoted—the ministry is referred to as an *office*—"an order of men whose office it is. &c." On another page we read,—“That the Christian ministry has been thus divinely instituted, we see, not so much from an express formula of words creating an *office*, &c.” To this is appended a note denying “that the *office* of the ministry flows directly from the Lord Jesus, as the fruit of His resurrection and triumphant ascension into heaven.” And this denial is supported by the fact, that Christ had *called* His disciples, and sent forth the seventy before His resurrection took place. Yet on another page the address speaks of this calling and instruction during the three years as being only preparatory to the actual investiture. “And when at last the solemn moment arrived, a moment fraught with such momentous consequences for the whole future world, He gave them the great commission.” It would seem from this, that the giving of the great commission was, after all, the Apostles' actual investiture with office. But let this suffice.

We repeat—there is much of the address which we can endorse, but to our mind it does not seem to be consistent with itself. There is especially an evident effort, whether consciously or unconsciously we say not, to push the sacramental and priestly into the background, in order to render conspicuous the word and the prophetic function. It is very easy to grow one-sided, especially in times of controversy. To this we attribute, in part at least, the failure in this address to bring out the whole idea of the Christian ministry, as it is set before us in the Word of God.

THE THEOLOGY OF CHRIST; *from His own Words.* By Joseph P. Thompson, New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1870.

We have been much interested in this work. It is fresh and vigorous, and evidently seeks a better stand-point for theology than the one very generally assumed. The author says in his preface: "Recent discussions of Christianity as a Faith have revolved about Christ, as a Person; and the Life of Christ, that formerly was shaped into biography for the instruction of the young, and the edification of the devout, has become an effective weapon of the theological polemics. But while within the sphere of theology this new significance has been given to the Life of Christ, the *Theology of Christ Himself* has hardly received the distinction due to it as the formative power in the Christian system, both as to faith and to practice. The doctrine of Christ was the very essence of His life, and constitutes, the true and vital Christianity." To this last remark we must take exception. It is not the *doctrine* of Christ, even as being of the very essence of His life, but that *life itself*, which constitutes the true and vital Christianity. In referring above to the "new significance given to the Life of Christ," reference is had to His *biography*. The author seeks to get nearer to the person of Christ than merely His life in this sense, and so would take us to His life-breathing words. But he does not seem to realize, that the words of Christ, any more than His works, cannot reveal to us the mystery of His person; but that His person as the Word of all words, must reveal the meaning of His words and acts. Hence we cannot agree with what follows: "In the teaching of Christ" (over against the conception of theology as philosophy applied to the Scriptures), "theology is declarative in its form, and directly practical in its intent. He sets forth the truth of God, and all things spiritual and divine, with a specific cast of doctrine, and a subjective relation of system, yet without the formulas of logic or the definitions of philosophy. Hence a truly Christian theology must be derived from the interpretation of His words by the laws of Exegesis, and the collection of detached sayings in their relations to the whole course of His teaching."

Christ did not come to teach a system, but to establish a kingdom of divine grace of which He is the head. His teaching was



designed to direct attention to *Himself*, as the fountain of life and salvation.

Much of His instruction, no doubt, which He imparted during the period between His resurrection and ascension is not recorded ; so that His recorded words would not include all He said while on earth.

But while we think the author is still in the vestibule only, and not in the glorious temple itself of *Christological Theology*, yet the chapters of His book are far superior to much that we meet with in the theology of the day. His discussion of the Intermediate State is interesting. He is free from the blind prejudice which many evince whenever this subject is named. He holds that the state between death and the resurrection is different from the state after the resurrection (as, one would suppose, all would acknowledge as a truism in theology). "The Paradise to which he goes may be as the park that surrounds the palace of the King ; he may have the freest range of the park, and the gardens, and may look through the paling upon the golden House of Beauty, and behold at times the face of the King and hear the praises of the cherubim—but he must wait for the gathering of the whole company from earth, and the endowment of the spiritual body before the gates that divide the palace from the park shall be thrown open that he may enter in."

The work shows a good acquaintance with, and use of, the latest and best German theologians. It contains an appendix in which the Genuineness and Characteristics of the Fourth Gospel are discussed, the views of Strauss and Baur noticed, a chapter on Dr. J. J. Van Oosterzee's Theology of the New Testament, one on Dr. Weiss on Future Punishment, and one on Dr. Delitzsch's view of the Intermediate State. Those whose tastes lead them in the direction of Theological study will find this book of more than common interest.

**HISTORY OF ENGLAND ;** *From the Fall of Wolsey, to the Defeat of the Spanish Armada.* By James Anthony Froude, M. A., New York : Charles Scribner & Company. 1870. Vols. XI. XII.

Since the last issue of this Review these two volumes have come to hand, which complete the series. The enterprising publishers deserve the thanks of the American public for bringing out this celebrated work in so cheap, convenient, and yet beautiful style. We can add nothing more to what has already been said in regard to its merits. It forms an edition which will prove a valuable addition as well as an ornament to private and public libraries.

**BIBLE NOTES ;** *For Daily Readers.* A Comment on Holy Scripture. By Ezra M. Hunt, A. M., M. D., Author of "Grace Cul-



ture," etc., in two volumes, New York: Charles Scribner & Co., 654 Broadway, 1870.

It might be supposed an uncalled for task to undertake a Commentary of the whole Bible in this age by one who is not a theologian. Can anything new be added to the thorough and exhaustive Commentaries that we already have? This work, however, has a different aim from that of the learned commentaries referred to. It is intended to be an aid for daily reading of the Holy Scriptures, and adapted for the use of families. Both volumes comprise over *thirteen hundred* pages. It is brought out in beautiful style, and will no doubt be sought after as a profitable aid in families for the constant reading of the Scriptures

ST. PAUL'S EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS. *A Revised Text, with Introduction, Notes, and Dissertations.* By J. B. Lightfoot, D. D., Hulsean Professor of Divinity, and Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Andover: Warren F. Draper, publisher, Main St. 1870. Pp. 396.

The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians is generally regarded as one of the most important doctrinal epistles of the New Testament. In it is taught in most emphatic terms the great doctrine of Justification by Faith, with its cognate truths. It presents a rich mine for earnest Christian research. Its contents, therefore, cannot be too carefully, or too thoroughly studied. The work of Dr. Lightfoot furnishes the biblical student with most valuable aid. It is thorough and exhaustive in its discussion of the various topics which claim attention. A brief outline of its contents is sufficient to indicate the correctness of what has just been affirmed.

The topics discussed in the Introduction, which covers sixty pages, are: The Galatian People; The Churches of Galatia; The Date of the Epistle; Genuineness of the Epistle; and Character and Contents of the Epistle. The Introduction is succeeded by Dissertations on the following three topics: Were the Galatians Celts or Teutons? The Brethren of our Lord; and St. Paul and the Three. These dissertations cover one hundred and thirty-eight pages. The remainder of the work is taken up with the Text and Commentary, followed by Notes on such topics as, St. Paul's Sojourn in Arabia; His First Visit to Jerusalem; The Name and Office of an Apostle; Various Readings of Gal. ii. 5; The Later Visit of St. Paul to Jerusalem; Patristic Accounts of the Collision at Antioch; The Interpretation of Deut. xxi. 23; The Words denoting "Faith;" The Faith of Abraham; St. Paul's Infirmary in the Flesh; The Various Readings in Gal. iv. 25; The Meaning of Hagar in Gal. iv. 5; Philo's Allegory of Hagar and Sarah; The Various Readings in Gal. v. 1; and Patristic Commentaries on this Epistle. The work closes with a copious Index of the several subjects treated.

The style of the writer is clear and forcible, and the arrangement of the work logical and good. No difficulty is experienced in following up the various points as they are successively discussed. The mechanical execution of the work is also good. It is printed on fair paper, with clear type, which circumstance will aid in commending it to favor. The work forms a valuable contribution to biblical and theological literature. F.

**THE HISTORY OF ROME.** *By Theodor Mommsen, in four volumes. Vol. IV, New York: Charles Scribner & Company, 654 Broadway. 1870.*

In the issue of this fourth volume, this great work has also been brought to completion. This last volume contains a copious appendix to the whole work of 27 pages.

**WONDERS OF ACOUSTICS; OR, THE PHENOMENA OF SOUND.** *From the French of Rodolphe Radau. The English revised by Robert Ball, M. A., with Illustrations. New York: Charles Scribner & Company. 1870.*

**WONDERFUL BALLOON ASCENTS; OR, THE CONQUESTS OF THE SKIES.** *A History of Balloon Voyages. From the French of F. Marion, with Illustrations. New York: Charles Scribner & Company. 1870.*

**WONDERS OF BODILY STRENGTH AND SKILL,** *in all Ages and in all Countries, with Illustrations. New York: Charles Scribner & Company. 1871.*

These are additional volumes of *The Cabinet of Wonders*, and, like those that have previously appeared, full of entertaining information. This library will be sought for, especially by the young.